DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 794 PS 015 351

AUTHOR	Pancrazio, Sally Bulkley; And Others
TITLE	Early Childhood Education Policy Study: An Overview and Policy Statement.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	Apr 85
NOTE	69p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Board of Education Policy; Day Care; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Policy; Kindergarten; *Preschool Education; Primary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; School Age Day Care; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to learn whether the benefits of early childhood education would be sufficient to cause the State of Illinois to either support or require the provision of such services. Primary attention is given to: (1) the education of non-handicapped children between birth and entrance into first grade, and (2) those programs and services which influence the primary education continuum of instruction. National socio-economic trends and social influences are described in relation to the current status of Illinois' early childhood education in pre-kindergarten and kindergarten programs. The study of pre-kindergarten programs addresses the following topics: the kinds of pre-kindergarten programs and services provided and numbers of children served; their effectiveness; and identification of potential clients. The study of kindergarten programs examines the following topics: enrollment changes in the last five years; the types of schedules and their effects on children; types of curricula and their effects on children; and use of chronological age to determine compulsory attendance and entrance eligibility. In addition to a listing of state and federal initiatives and a summary of findings, an appendix provides a sample copy of the Early Childhood Education Program Survey Instrument used in 1984 to obtain baseline data on programs and to assess opinions of principals regarding early childhood education issues. A pamphlet describing the State Board of Education Policy Statement on early childhood education is also given. (DST)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED261794

Early Childhood Education Policy Study...

•an overview•

PS 015351

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sally B. Pancrazio
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION POLICY STUDY: AN OVERVIEW

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Springfield, Illinois

April 1985

Walter W. Naumer, Jr., Chairman
State Board of Education

Ted Sanders
State Superintendent of Education

FOREWORD

In April 1983, the State Board of Education directed its staff to conduct an early childhood education policy study. The Overview report was presented to the State Board of Education on March 14, 1985. Recommendations were made to the Board on April 11, 1985 and approved by the Board on May 9, 1985.

Numerous background reports were prepared by the Board's Early Childhood Education Task Force, directed by Dr. Sally Bulkley Pancrazio, Manager, Research and Statistics Section. Inquiries about this report should be directed to the Research and Statistics Section.

Ted Sanders
State Superintendent of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND. 1

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DIRECTIVE. 1

FOCUS OF THE STUDY. 1

STUDY METHODOLOGY 3

EMERGENCE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN AMERICA 4

PAST EFFORTS OF THE STATE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION. 5

STATUS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN ILLINOIS 6

PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS 7

What pre-kindergarten programs and services are provided in Illinois and how many children are served by them?. . . . 7

What is the effectiveness of these programs and services?. 11

Who else could benefit from these programs and services? . 15

KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS 16

What is the status of kindergarten enrollment in Illinois? 16

What types of kindergarten schedules are used and what effect do they have on children? 17

What types of kindergarten curricula are used and what effect do they have on children? 20

How is chronological age used in determining compulsory attendance and eligibility to enter school?. 25

ADDITIONAL PERSPECTIVES 31

STATE AND FEDERAL INITIATIVES 38

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 39

APPENDIX A

Consultants Meeting with Early Childhood. 40
Education Task Force

REFERENCES. 42

TABLE OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Before and After-School Supervision in Latchkey Programs - 1984-85.	9
2	Statewide Estimates of Eligible Illinois Children Served and not Served by Head Start. . .	10
3	Changes in Kindergarten Enrollment in Illinois Schools	17
4	Kindergarten Scheduling in Illinois Public Schools: 1980-81 to 1983-84	18
5	Curriculum Orientation for Illinois Kindergartens	21
6	Reported Changes in Kindergarten Curriculum. . . .	22
7	Kindergarten Entry Eligibility in the States . . .	27
8	Numbers and Types of Early Childhood Education Programs Operated by Public and Nonpublic Schools	32
9	Teaching Experience of Illinois Elementary School Principals	33
10	Formal Coursework and Workshop Experiences of Illinois Elementary School Principals	34
11	Teaching Certificates for Teachers in Early Childhood Education Programs, Pre-K through 3 . .	34
12	Opinions of Illinois Elementary Principals Concerning the Public School's Providing Selected ECE Services	37

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION POLICY STUDY: AN OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DIRECTIVE

In April 1983, the State Board of Education directed its staff to conduct an early childhood education policy study. The need for such a policy study was based on several factors: legislative proposals from past General Assembly sessions regarding entry age into kindergarten; the encouragement of "latchkey" programs in public schools; the funding of full-day kindergarten; and the Board's own mandate studies directing further study of preschool programs for limited-English-proficient children and an examination of the compulsory attendance age of 7.

Underlying these issues was the recognition that future academic success or intellectual growth of school children is influenced, in large part, by the experiences they have at an early age. Also bearing on these issues was the recognition that with the increase of single-parent families, the prevalence of two working parents outside the home, and other sociological changes, the role of the school in responding to these changing family demographics needed examination.

The specific authorizing directive of the Board was:

> Early Childhood Education - While there are numerous reasons for further investigation of the potential benefits of pre-kindergarten education for handicapped and non-English-proficient children, a study should include potential benefits, as well as any disadvantages, of pre-kindergarten education for all children. The study would be conducted with the intent of discerning whether any benefits of early childhood education would be sufficient to cause the state to either support or require the provision of such services.

FOCUS OF THE STUDY

The aspect of early childhood education given primary attention in this paper is that of the education of non-handicapped children between birth and the time such children enter first grade. This age span was given particular emphasis because of the Board's directive; however, attention was also given to those programs and services provided to young children which have a bearing on the primary continuum of instruction.

In developing this focus, handicapped children were excluded because services for these children are already required from the age of three. In addition, the State Board of Education has approved seeking an extension of this requirement to include services to handicapped children, from birth to age three, who would benefit educationally from such services.

The scope which early childhood education entails is broad. Yet, other important related topics surround early childhood education and children up to the time they enter first grade. As a result, there was a need to narrow the focus of the study.

Six months into the study, there were, for example, numerous national reports of child abuse occurring in day care settings. Reports of such horrors led to consideration of issues focusing upon the health, security, and welfare of children. This problem, and its possible incidence in Illinois, however, was viewed as beyond the scope of this study.

Other areas which were recognized as important to early childhood education but beyond the scope of this particular study were transportation, school nutrition, and parent education. The first two were excluded because how districts provide nutrition programs and transportation would better be considered after recommendations are approved. The literature on parent education was so extensive, diversified and, yet, group-specific that, that too was felt to be beyond the scope of the Board's directive.

Last, daycare services to Illinois children and the quality of that daycare were delimitations. They are included, but to a limited degree, due to unavailability of information. The licensing of caregivers and non-school facilities is a function of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS). The count of Illinois children receiving daycare could not be determined. Caregivers providing daycare for up to eight children do not have to be licensed by DCFS. Licensed facilities are authorized to receive up to a certain number of children at any one time, but may serve fewer children. Therefore, the number of children receiving such care cannot be determined from state records. From national data, however, estimates for Illinois children have been made and are presented in this report.

Examples of early childhood education programs included five basic categories: daycare, preschool services, kindergartens, latchkey programs in schools, and transitional grades through third grade. Specific definitions used for these programs follow.

- Daycare services include those custodial and supervisory services provided to children by a caregiver, who is not a member of the child's immediate family, either in the child's home or the caregiver's home, and those services which are outside a home environment that provide primarily supervision and custodial care for children, but may have an educational component.

- Preschool services are those that emphasize educational and developmental activities as the primary focus of an organized and planned program for children not yet enrolled in kindergarten.

- Kindergartens are programs of initial entry into school which are provided on a variety of schedules: half-day every day, full-day every day, full-day on alternate days, or full-day for two years.

- Latchkey programs are school-based services designed to provide supervision of children before and/or after regular school hours.

- Transitional grades are grades that overlap two or more years of the primary continuum of instruction -- kindergarten, first, second, and third grades -- and are designed for students who need additional services before transferring into the traditional grades.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

Information Sources

Staff consulted with nationally known early childhood educators, directors of programs in other state and local childcare centers and preschools, directors of school-based programs, staff in other state agencies, instructors of childcare providers, and critics of involvement in such programs. These consultants are listed in Appendix A. Acknowledgment of these special people is made because they provided the "spark and spirit" to the staff's efforts. As people directly involved in the care, welfare, and education of young children, their insights were extremely helpful.

Staff also made on-site visits to programs in Chicago and Champaign-Urbana. Direct observation of children in these programs provided a constant and personal frame of reference and a reminder of the responsibility entailed in the debates on issues.

Two surveys were conducted as part of this study. First, a comprehensive survey of all Illinois public and nonpublic elementary school principals was undertaken in September 1984. The purpose of this survey was to obtain baseline data regarding early childhood education (ECE) programs in public and nonpublic Illinois schools and to assess the opinions of principals in these schools regarding ECE issues. (See Appendix B for copy of the survey.) The principal was selected as respondent because of the principal's instructional leadership role. Questionnaires were sent to 2,946 public school principals, and 1,095 nonpublic school principals. Responses were obtained from nearly 94% of the public school principals and from 80% of the nonpublic school principals, for a total response rate of 90%.

Second, early childhood education specialists in all state education agencies were contacted and interviewed in order to obtain up-to-date information concerning the status of kindergarten and other early childhood education proposals, by state. In some instances, staff in Governor's Offices or Legislative Bureaus were also contacted for additional information. This survey was conducted as of November 1984. Information was obtained from all states.

In addition, background reports which analyzed and synthesized available research on early childhood education were developed. These reports provided the formal background of information from which the policy report was written. The reports include the following:

- Brief History of Early Childhood Education in America
- Kindergarten Schedules: Status of Patterns in Illinois and a Review of the Research
- The Kindergarten Curriculum: Current Issues

- Entry Criteria for Kindergarten
- Class Sizes for Kindergarten and Primary Grades: A Review of the Research
- Status of Early Childhood Education in Other States
- Estimates of Eligible Illinois Children Served and Not Served by Head Start
- Estimates of Preschool Experiences and Childcare Arrangements of Illinois Children
- Status of Illinois State Board of Education Efforts in Early Childhood Education
- Selected Preschool Screening and Diagnostic Instruments: A Technical Review
- Effectiveness of Early Childhood Education Programs: A Review of the Research
- Problems of Young Children Adjusting to School
- Review of Research on the Special Educational Needs of:
  Children of Teenage Parents
  Limited-English-Proficient Children
  Children from Poverty or Low-Income Homes

EMERGENCE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN AMERICA

The first education initiatives in America focused on older children. Early childhood education came with changing societal needs.

Kindergartens

Early childhood education in America emerged as a result of the influence of Friedrich Froebel. He founded the first known kindergarten in Blankenburg, Germany in 1837. Strong emphasis in Froebel's kindergarten (literally "garden for children") was placed on the educational value of play (Ross, 1976). The first known American kindergarten was established in Watertown, Wisconsin in 1856. In 1873, the first public school kindergarten was established in St. Louis. In the early 1900s, professional kindergarten associations were established to promote public kindergartens. In 1912, there was a total of 312,000 six-year-old children enrolled in kindergarten -- less than 5% of American children of this age (Cryan and Surbeck, 1979).

Census figures for children in Illinois reflect the increase in the availability of kindergarten services. For comparison purposes, enrollment rates for five and six-year-old children are used, since it is primarily these ages that constitute the majority of enrollment in kindergarten. In 1930 and 1940, approximately 47% of five and six-year-old children in Illinois were enrolled in school. By 1950, approximately 65% of the children in this age range were enrolled in school. Approximately 75% of the children ages five and six were enrolled in school in 1960. By 1970, the proportion of five and six-year-old children enrolled in school had increased to approximately 81%. And, by 1980, approximately 90% of five and six-year-old children were enrolled in school (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980). (A portion of those five-year-olds not in school would not have been eligible to attend school because of the month of their birth.) Kindergarten attendance is not required by Illinois state law. The law stipulates that children at the age of seven must be in attendance.

Nursery Schools

Throughout the 1920s, significant progress was also being made in the establishment of nursery schools nationwide. Nursery schools included preschools with a structured curriculum as well as basic daycare institutions. The beginning of nursery school education in the United States was mainly in the private sector, and these nursery schools were primarily custodial. In 1924, the first nursery school was established within a public school system. By 1930, there were nationally over 250 nursery schools in both nonpublic and public school systems (The Encyclopedia of Education, 1971).

Daycare

Daycare for infants and children through age twelve is a relatively recent phenomenon. The passing of the agrarian society brought manifold changes in earlier structures and relationships concerning home and place of work, the extension of the common school as an educational institution, and the evolution of the role of women in society and the work place (Ziegler and Cascione, 1980). The order or interrelatedness of these changes is not important to this discussion; however, it is significant that roles and expectations of society regarding preschool and after-school care and experiences of children have been substantially and irreversibly altered from those of the past (Van Diem, 1984).

Latchkey Programs

Today, most parents of young children find it necessary or desirable to work outside the home. There is a continuing increase in the incidence of families where both parents work and single-parent families where the parent works. These working parents are confronted with the problem of securing appropriate care for their preschool-age children as well as for their school-age children for the time beyond the regular school hours. These programs have been referred to as "latchkey" programs because of children who wear house keys on chains around their necks since no one would be at home to let them in after school hours were over. Latchkey programs are typically custodial and supervisory in nature, rather than early childhood education programs. They may have an education component and may involve young children.

PAST EFFORTS OF THE STATE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Early childhood education has received periodic attention from the state education agency. In 1971, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction developed a document, Action Goals for the 70s, which contained the following objectives:

> By 1973-74, a cooperative working arrangement among institutions of higher education, parent groups, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and other agencies should be implemented to establish alternate models for pre-kindergarten curriculum and parent education programs.
>
> By 1975, develop improved procedures and techniques for the identification, diagnosis, and prescriptive teaching of exceptional pre-kindergarten children.

> By the 1976-77 school term, every school district will provide a pre-kindergarten program for children ages three and four. Enrollment in such programs will not be mandatory.

In the fall of 1973, a survey was conducted of more than 5,000 randomly selected Illinois residents to ascertain attitudes about specific Illinois education issues. One of the issues was education for three and four-year olds. A clear majority of the respondents did not support programs for four year-olds. Support for programs for three-year-olds was even less.

In June 1975, approximately 5,000 education leaders in Illinois completed an agency-sponsored questionnaire on educational priorities. At that time, early childhood education was considered to be critical by slightly less than 20% of the respondents. In October 1975, a staff report to the Illinois Board of Education was developed at the Board's request. The report recommended the development and implementation of an early childhood education policy; a cooperative relationship among agencies to "formalize preservice training and inservice retraining of teachers, supportive personnel, and paraprofessionals for early childhood programs." Further, coordination with other child development agencies, refining existing instruments for the diagnosis of potential "high-risk children, and universally available early childhood programs" were identified. No action was taken on these proposals.

While early childhood education has been occurring in Illinois for many years, it was clear that the aforementioned proposals were "ahead of their time." That is, a majority of the general public, educators, and educational policymakers was not then in support of these programs.

STATUS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN ILLINOIS

Attention to early childhood education has dramatically increased in the past decade. Demand for programs has increased, including those in the public schools. The evidence on successful early educational intervention programs has been widely reported. The traditional kindergarten is changing and schools are providing more options to the traditional primary program.

Several factors have led to the current perspective on early childhood education. The major factor was that women with school-age children increasingly entered the work force. Huber (1982) states:

> Between 1950 and 1980 the labor force participation of wives with children under age 18 increased from 18% to 54% . . . . By 1990 the mothers of about four fifths of children 6 to 18 will be in the labor force. . . .

Accompanying this trend, according to Huber, were an increase in the level of education and a decrease in fertility. A shift in women's work from home to workplace, she said, could only occur after fertility declined. Fertility in America is "below or hovering around replacement -- about 1.9 lifetime births per woman." Huber reports that it is unlikely that the

downward fertility trend will be significantly reversed. What these combined trends mean is that women in the work force must seek preschool child-care arrangements, and when the child is of school age, before and after-school care. Because these women are better educated, their demands for higher quality daycare are more vocal. Hymes (1985) reported that nationally "8 million mothers with children under six (52%) were on a job in March 1984, including nearly half of all mothers of infants and children under age three."

A second factor is the increase in the number of households headed by single parents, usually women, whose income is at or below the poverty level. The phenomenon has been referred to as the "feminization of poverty." There is an increasing number of low-income children who enter kindergarten already well behind their more affluent peers in language development, social experiences, and cognitive ability. Yet, these children were born healthy.

A third factor is the increase in the number of children who survived medical problems at birth and/or are born to immature females, themselves children. These young children, often of low birth weight, tend to be developmentally delayed in comparison with their peers. Children of young parents frequently experience neglect and abuse in addition to poverty. They, too, enter kindergarten already behind their age-mates.

This section of the report uses two major perspectives--pre-kindergarten, and kindergarten programs--to describe the status of early childhood education in Illinois and the impact of these factors as schools attempt to respond to the greater range of differences among children entering school. To the extent possible, where Illinois data were not available, estimates using national data were made for the State.

PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS

The study of pre-kindergarten programs in Illinois addresses the following major questions.

- What pre-kindergarten programs and services are provided in Illinois and how many children are served by them?
- What is the effectiveness of these pre-kindergarten programs and services?
- Who else could benefit from pre-kindergarten programs and services?

WHAT PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ARE PROVIDED IN ILLINOIS AND HOW MANY CHILDREN ARE SERVED BY THEM?

The extent to which groups of children are enrolled in pre-kindergarten programs provides a basis for determining whether current programs are at least adequate in terms of the number they serve. For most programs, the data indicate that large numbers of children who would benefit from early childhood programs are going unserved.

Children with Experience in Preschool, Daycare and Head Start

In 1980, about half of the 500,000 Illinois children between 3 and 6 years of age were enrolled in a group instructional program such as Head Start, preschool, or other group care. In terms of educational impact, this means that about half of the children entered kindergarten with one or two years of group instructional experiences while the other half might be experiencing group instruction for the first time. Children who enter kindergarten with prior experience may have less need for the transitional activities typically required. Children without preschool experience must adapt to the presence of a peer group and the formal class procedures used in the school setting. From an educational perspective, children with preschool group experiences and children without preschool experience may represent two diverse groups in terms of social readiness skills (Naron, 1981).

Group instruction data do not provide an adequate picture of the educational or societal needs of children. Substantial numbers of children omitted from the group receiving instructional services do, in fact, require child-care services from adults other than their parents. Current child-care services for young children are not known.

Furthermore, school principals in Illinois elementary schools reported that public schools have virtually no cooperative arrangements with outside groups in the provision of preschool programs. Approximately 9% of public and nonpublic schools are used by public, nonpublic or parent volunteer groups as the site for child-care or preschool programs, independent of school authorities. More than 90% report no formal cooperation with such groups.

Count of Children Needing Supervision

Estimates from the 1980 Census data for Illinois show that almost 567,000 married couples in the state have children under the age of 6 and that there are almost 107,000 single parents with children under age 6. Applying the labor market participation rate of 48.2% for women with children of age 5 or less to the Illinois data and assuming all single parents work or need to work, it is estimated that almost 380,000 working Illinois parents need some form of child-care arrangement.

Based on national statistics (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983), as many as 800 Illinois working parents may be leaving one or more children under age 6 unsupervised, that is, in situations in which well over 1,000 young children may be left to care for themselves almost daily. It is reasonable to assume that the number of working parents who leave young children of school age unsupervised during some part of the day (either before school or after school) exceeds those who leave children under age 6 unsupervised.

These estimates are relevant since the provision of appropriate child care is accepted as a necessity for favorable child development. The quality of child care and the environment in which this care is provided is of concern to parents and educators because of its influence on the children's future educational and social attainments.

About 40% of the children under age twelve come from an estimated 1,123,564 Illinois families with substandard incomes. Families meeting these criteria were assumed generally to be unable to secure adequate child-care services because of financial limitations. This means that approximately 827,498 children may be receiving inadequate childcare services.

By combining the estimated number of children currently receiving day-care services with the estimated number of children possibly receiving inadequate day-care services and subtracting the number of children who are in both categories, an estimate of total child-care need was derived. The estimate for 1980 was 1,567,033 children or 76% of the population of children under 12 years old. Toddlers and preschoolers, of course, must be supervised closely. For elementary school children, supervision after school tends to reduce the time that children might spend in activities that harm themselves or the community.

Table 1 shows that only 54 schools in Illinois have reported the availability of a latchkey program. Emphasized here is the discrepancy between the number of children having two working parents and the number of children who have supervision available before and after the school day in the latchkey programs.

Table 1: Before and After-School Supervision in Latchkey Programs - 1984-85

	Number of Programs	Number of Children	Number of Children on Waiting List
Nonpublic	37	914	337
Public	17	617	50

Source: Early Childhood Education Program Survey, October 1984.

Head Start Programs

Recognition of both the educational and social needs to insure adequate environments for the development of young children led to the initiation of preschool programs for children from low income families. In 1964, the federal government funded Project Head Start. This program for low-income, preschool children was designed to provide the children with knowledge, habits and attitudes which would facilitate their successful adjustment to the elementary school situation.

Four main criteria pertain to Head Start enrollment eligibility: family income, age, handicapping condition, and need. At least 90% of the children enrolled in each Head Start program must be from "low-income families." The term "low-income family" refers to a family whose total annual income (gross

before taxes) is equal to or less than the amount specified in the Family Income Guidelines or a family which is receiving public assistance. The Family Income Guidelines represent the official poverty threshold specified by the U. S. Office of Management and Budget. The income threshold varies with the size of the family unit, and it is revised annually to allow for changes in the cost of living as reflected in the Consumer Price Index. The 1984 poverty threshold, for example, is $10,200 for a family of four and $13,680 for a family of six.

For the 1984-85 program year, 68,220 Illinois children were eligible for Head Start. (This count adjusts for the proportion of five-year-olds who would have been eligible to enroll in kindergarten.) While 21,178 received services (31%), 47,042 did not. (See Table 2.) It is, of course, possible that other educational services were provided to these children, but it is unlikely since most other programs would have been at a cost to the parents.

Table 2: Statewide Estimates of Eligible Illinois Children Served and Not Served by Head Start

Head Start Estimates

Program Year	Number Eligible	Number Served	Number Not Served	Percent Not Served
1983-84	87,349	19,618	67,731	77.5%
1984-85	87,349	21,178	66,171	75.8%

Head Start Estimates Adjusted for 5-Year-Olds in School

Program Year	Number Eligible	Number Served	Number Not Served	Percent Not Served
1983-84	68,220	19,618	48,602	71.2%
1984-85	68,220	21,178	47,042	69.0%

Source: State Board of Education, Research and Statistics, 1984.

There were twenty-one counties in Illinois where no children were reported as receiving Head Start services.

Typically, the Head Start program is operated four days per week for half days. One Head Start program director said that this barely provided time for the nutrition, health, and welfare concerns of these children, much less their educational needs. She also said that with children from more affluent families receiving expensive preschool or day care services, Head Start children would already be behind their more affluent peers in kindergarten.

Programs for Limited-English Proficient Children

The best estimate of the number of limited or non-English-speaking children in Illinois is approximately 16,600 three and four-year-olds (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980). Of this group, only 600 children are receiving preschool programs, with only a third of those funded by the state. This represents about 3.5% of this group of children. Nearly 4,400 limited-English-proficient children are enrolled in kindergarten programs, but this represents about 55% of the five-year-old limited-English-proficient children in Illinois. These children, who are disproportionately at risk for academic failure and low achievement because of the language barrier, are also minimally represented in current preschool programs in Illinois.

WHAT IS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THESE PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES?

Preschool programs have been found to be effective when outcomes were measured by intelligence quotient score, scholastic achievement, academic placement, non-cognitive development, and social responsibility. Although research shows that low-income children benefit the most from preschool programs, other groups with special needs can also benefit. These include limited-English-proficient children, children of teenage parents, children from middle-income and affluent families, and gifted children.

Indicators of Program Effectiveness

The identification of indicators of program effectiveness is important to policymakers and program developers. These are expressed in terms of the outcomes for which programs are designed. Several indicators have been identified from the literature. They are useful in evaluating the overall effectiveness of programs, designing new programs and funding such programs.

A major indicator used has been intelligence quotient (IQ). In initial evaluations of early childhood education programs, changes in IQ scores were taken as the major indicator of program effectiveness. The finding that preschool education leads to short-term gains in IQ scores of between 10 and 20 points for experimental groups in comparison to control groups is well established in research (Bereiter and Engleman, 1966; Karnes, 1969; Weikart, 1970). However, longitudinal evaluations (Bronfenbrenner, 1974; Lazar and Darlington, 1979) also revealed a pattern of converging scores, leaving experimental and control groups equivalent by the end of second grade and thereafter. This "wash-out" effect of IQ scores resulted in an initial perception of a deterioration of the positive effects of preschool in the long term. But growing reservations about the validity and limitations of using IQ as the predictor and sole indicator of academic achievement led to the inclusion of scholastic achievement, academic placement, non-cognitive development, and social responsibility as other indicators of effectiveness.

More recent studies have recognized the lack of precision in measuring the IQ and have identified higher cognitive ability--as the ability to perform on standardized tests. School success for children who have participated in preschool education begins with higher cognitive ability. It continues with improved scholastic achievement, as measured in standardized reading, mathematics, and language achievement tests, as found by the Consortium for

Longitudinal Studies (Lazar and Darlington, 1979) and other studies (Nieman and Gastright, 1981; Chattin-McNichols, 1981). Significant improvement in these areas was found by the Perry Preschool Study as late as age 14 (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1980), which was interpreted as evidence of measurable long-lasting effects of preschool.

Other program indicators refer to placements, grade promotions, and graduation. Measures of scholastic placement include a reduction in special education placements, retentions in grade, and high school dropout rates. All indicate consistently favorable outcomes for children who had preschool education (Lazar and Darlington, 1979; Vopava and Royce, 1978; Schweinhart and Weikart, 1980).

Other desirable indicators of program effectiveness were identified. These included such non-cognitive indicators as more positive attitudes toward school, reduced absences and increased task-orientation, achievement motivation, self-esteem and social competency (New York State, 1982; Lazar and Darlington, 1979; Schweinhart and Weikart, 1984). When parents were involved in the program, there were equally beneficial changes in parents' attitudes and achievement expectations -- an effect considered instrumental in promoting the long-lasting positive outcomes of preschool programs (New York State, 1982; Lazar, 1981).

Measures of social responsibility as used in the Perry Preschool Study, the only longitudinal study to collect such comprehensive data, indicated lower rates of delinquency, crime, welfare assistance, and teenage pregnancy as well as higher rates of high school graduation, enrollment in post-secondary education, and employment for preschool children followed through age 19 (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1984).

Today there is an apparent consensus that evaluations should include multiple indicators of program effectiveness in order to assess adequately the multiple effects of preschool (Rutter, 1983; Clarke, 1984). The concept of multiple preschool effects posits a complex network of causes and effects in which preschool education sets in motion ongoing multiple consequences. In this process, initial IQ gains and the higher cognitive ability they reflect, trigger better school achievement and performance. In the long term this school success is also transformed into life success.

Effectiveness of Services for Children from Middle-Class or Affluent Families

Most of the research on program effectiveness in this area of education applies to low-income children. But there are some initial findings (Creech, 1982; Larsen, 1983) indicating that affluent or middle-class children, although generally not considered at risk for educational and social failure, may nevertheless benefit from preschool education. Other early childhood educators are not so certain. Dr. Lilian Katz, University of Illinois, states that these benefits tend to be trivial in comparison to the benefits accrued to low-income children. More research needs to be conducted on the benefits of early educational experiences for the more affluent child. If programs are designed to provide experiences that supplement, rather than duplicate experiences the children are receiving elsewhere, preschool education may effectively enhance the varied dimensions of their individual development.

Effectiveness of Services for Low-Income Children

According to 1980 Census data, there are about 82,000 children between the ages of three and five in Illinois living in families or households below the poverty level. The majority of these children (54%) were not enrolled in a preschool program, and yet they are the children who have experienced disproportionate difficulty with formal schooling. Indeed, early federal preschool programs such as Head Start were conceived as a means of countering the adverse effects of poverty environments. Children from these environments were considered at risk of failure in school. Children who live in conditions of poverty face deficits that are considered to be predictors of later academic difficulties (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1981): low educational attainment of the parents, low occupational and income status of the parents, initially low cognitive ability, and relatively low achievement expectations of the parents for the child. These are the children whose families usually cannot purchase the early childhood education services available to children from more affluent families. To some extent, depending on child and family characteristics, financial resources translate into developmental outcomes (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1984). Children from low-income families are, therefore, the most at risk for special education placement, comparatively less academic achievement and attainment, school leaving, unemployment, welfare, and delinquency.

Participation in preschool education has both immediate and long-term benefits for these children and their families. Preschool education produces significant improvement in early cognitive performance and in academic achievement during the school years of these children. Their non-cognitive development and social responsibility are improved. Their levels of scholastic attainment, post-secondary education and employment are increased while their rates of teenage pregnancy and delinquency are decreased. The achievement expectations of the parents, both for their children and for their own continuing education, are raised. These attitudinal and motivational changes occur simultaneously with improvements in cognitive development as an outcome of early childhood education. These changes give these children, and their families, an opportunity for school success that eventually becomes life success.

A cost-benefit analysis of the Perry Preschool Program for socioeconomically disadvantaged children estimates economic benefits over the lifetime of the participants to have a present value of seven times the cost of one year of the program. Savings from reduced special education placements alone, calculated on a per child basis, paid for the cost of one year of the preschool program (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1984).

Effectiveness as a Function of Program Characteristics and Cost

Specific program features contributing to effectiveness are only now being identified. Among those are program continuity and parental involvement, which are essential to the long-term effectiveness of any preschool program (Lazar and Darlington, 1979; New York State, 1982). Program continuity, which includes a staff development component, is intended to assure that current instruction builds effectively on skills children have acquired in preschool.

There are also indications that parental involvement improves the child's level of achievement and attitude toward school. It also increases parents' expectations of the educational achievement and attainment of their children and improves parent-child communications on the affective and cognitive levels (Smilansky, 1979; Schweinhart and Weikart, 1984). It is thought that once parents see themselves as effective in the early education of their children, they are more inclined to continue in this supportive role after the program ends (Randel and Elovson, 1978; New York State, 1982).

A high quality preschool program has the following characteristics (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1978; 1984; New York State, 1982; Weikart, 1985):

- instructional leader: a full-time instructional leader supervising adherence to curriculum goals, program continuity, and delivery of services, as scheduled, as well as conducting regular evaluations.

- staff: dedicated staff that are mutually supportive and provide individual attention to children.

- adult-child ratio: at least two adults, regardless of size of group of children. For a group of children with few or no special needs, an adult-child ratio of 2:16 is recommended. The two adults should be, at least, a teacher certificated in early childhood education and a paraprofessional adult.

- curriculum: clearly defined curriculum goals focusing on the child's developmental readiness and including active learning of language and number concepts, planning and problem solving, and a high level of adult-child and child-child interaction.

- parent involvement: parent education specific to the needs of the child and leading to direct parental involvement in the child's developmental progress in school and at home.

- duration: at least a one-year program operating full-time, with at least 2 1/2 - 3 hours per day spent in a structured curriculum.

- program continuity: staff development for the purpose of increasing continuity in curriculum and in children's experiences from preschool through grade three.

- support services: nutritional and health care services.

There is currently no evidence that a program duration of two years produces greater benefits to participating children than a one-year program. From the point of view of program effectiveness, a more important consideration is the quality of program operation (Weikart, 1985).

Concerning these characteristics, implemented using alternative delivery modes, a current, unit-cost range is estimated to be from $1,149 - $3,319 per child.

WHO ELSE COULD BENEFIT FROM PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES?

Children of Teenage Parents

According to current Illinois Census data, about 130,000 teenage mothers are raising 150,000 children under the age of five. While the total number of births to teenage mothers decreased 6.9% from 1981 to 1982, the rate of births per 1,000 white females aged 11 through 14 increased 15.9% during that same period.

Further, 92% of the children born to 11 to 14-year-old mothers were born out of wedlock. Often the teenage mother does not marry the child's father nor obtain his assistance in raising the child. The teenage mother's likely immaturity and the absence of an extended family contribute to the mother's need for parenting education. Her early parenthood also usually means reduced educational attainment and fewer job opportunities. As a consequence of these familial and environmental circumstances, both mother and child face immediate emotional, educational, and financial deficits.

Since young mothers are simultaneously children and parents, they often have mistaken expectations of the child's phases of development and of his or her needs, and their parenting attitudes are frequently not positive. The teenage mother generally lacks and needs adequate information about the child's nutritional, health-care and various developmental needs, including emotional, social, cognitive and language development during the child's preschool years.

Infants and children of teenage mothers are a high-risk group. Their low birth weight, poor nutrition, and other adverse health effects due to socioeconomic disadvantages place them at greater risk of illness and death than other children (Oppel and Royston, 1971). Since there is a high incidence of abuse in the population of teenage mothers, their children are at risk of abuse leading to developmental problems (Scott, Field, and Robertson, 1981). These children also tend to be underweight and have more behavioral problems (Scott, Field and Robertson, 1981), and due to the low socioeconomic and educational status of the mother, they show deficits in preschool cognitive performance (Furstenberg, 1981).

Thus, the children of teenage parents are more likely to have special needs than children of older parents. These needs can be met in comprehensive early intervention programs designed to assist the young mother in developing effective parenting skills and attitudes, meet the child's developmental needs, and involve the mother effectively in the child's education.

Limited-English-Proficient Children

According to 1980 Census data, there are about 24,360 children between the ages of three and five in Illinois living in families or households in which little or no English is spoken. Limited English proficient children share many of the familial and environmental deficits of low-income children that lead to later academic difficulties: low occupational and income status, as well as low educational attainment of the parents; initially low cognitive ability; and relatively low achievement expectations. But added to those already formidable obstacles to educational success is these children's limited proficiency in English.

These children are at risk of special education placement, comparatively less academic achievement and attainment, and more remediation, school leaving, unemployment and welfare. Nationally, a disproportionate number of limited-English-proficient children are mistakenly placed into special education and/or tracked into vocational education (Cummins, 1982; National Commission, 1984). Data on Illinois are not known. Concerning remediation needs, the National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, for example, found that 25% of Hispanic students entering high school are older than their classmates, mostly due to remediation delays in earlier grades, some of which may be attributed to limited-English proficiency when they entered school.

Such cumulative deficits, originating in the preschool environment of these children and compounded during the school years, can be decreased and countered with effective preschool programs. Limited-English-proficient children who participated in preschool programs were found to have improved readiness for school and school performance as measured by achievement tests in grades 1 to 3. They also made significant gains in English language development (Scruggs, 1977; Doss and others, 1979).

Gifted Children

Gifted children are defined in The School Code of Illinois as "children whose mental development is accelerated beyond the average to the extent they need and can profit from specially planned educational services." There are no precise counts of the number of gifted children in Illinois, but a 5% estimate is often used. Assuming that 5% of all Illinois children within a given age range are indeed gifted, there are approximately 24,000 children, age 3-5, who may fit the definition as given in the statute. A 1982 survey of programs in the United States identified only 18 programs nationwide for gifted children under the age of 5 (Karnes, 1983). The numbers of Illinois programs and children in those programs are unknown.

KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS

The study of kindergarten programs in Illinois addressed the following major questions.

- What is the status of kindergarten enrollment in Illinois?
- What types of kindergarten curricula are used and what effect do they have on children?
- What types of kindergarten schedules are used and what effect do they have on children?
- How is chronological age used in determining compulsory attendance and eligibility to enter school?

WHAT IS THE STATUS OF KINDERGARTEN ENROLLMENT IN ILLINOIS?

Table 3 reports the kindergarten enrollments for the past five years for both public schools and nonpublic schools.

Table 3: Changes in Kindergarten Enrollment in Illinois Schools

Public School Enrollment

Year	Kindergarten	% Change in K Enrollment
1979-80	134,829	-2.5%
1980-81	133,967	-3.2%
1981-82	131,285	-2.0%
1982-83	135,742	+3.4%
1983-84	133,020	-2.0%
	Nonpublic School Enrollment	
1979-80	17,581	+7.8%
1980-81	20,276	+15.3%
1981-82	21,304	+5.1%
1982-83	22,912	+7.5%
1983-84	23,868	+4.2%

Source: State Board of Education, Public and Nonpublic School Fall Enrollment Reports

Table 3 shows 133,020 children were enrolled in public school kindergartens and another 23,868 children were enrolled in nonpublic kindergartens. Total enrollment in public schools has been steadily declining from 1979-80 to 1983-84 (a decrease of 190,000), but kindergarten enrollment has decreased only slightly (a decline of 1,800). Public schools accounted for 88.5% of all kindergarten students in 1979-80 and 84.8% of all kindergarten students in 1983-84. Likewise, 11.5% of all Illinois kindergarten children attended nonpublic schools in 1979-80 and 15.2% attended nonpublic schools in 1983-84. The overall increase of attendance in nonpublic school kindergartens was nearly 36%.

WHAT TYPES OF KINDERGARTEN SCHEDULES ARE USED AND WHAT EFFECT DO THEY HAVE ON CHILDREN?

Three different types of kindergarten schedules are used in Illinois public schools: (1) half-day, everyday; (2) all-day or full-day on alternate days; and (3) all-day or full-day, everyday. Using the first scheduling pattern, children attend kindergarten for several hours during either the morning or the afternoon five days a week. Under the full-day, alternate day kindergarten schedule, children attend school all day on alternate days. Usually this means that children will go to school three days on one week (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) and two days the following week (Tuesday and Thursday). The pattern then repeats itself in subsequent weeks. A

variation of the full-day, alternate day schedule, however, is to have children attend school on two alternate days during the first four days of the week and then attend all day on Friday every other week. Children attending full-day, everyday kindergartens, of course, attend school all day, five days a week. (See Table 4.)

Local district administrators and school boards adopt different types of kindergarten schedules for a variety of reasons. The half-day, everyday kindergartens are currently the most common in Illinois. The predominant argument in support of half-day kindergartens is that half-day programs are best for children making the transition from home to school. The purpose of kindergarten, it is argued, is to present the larger world to the child in preparation for first grade -- to serve as "a social and educational vehicle to absorb the child from the home into the larger society" (Belgrad, 1984). This objective is often best achieved by having children attend kindergarten for a half-day, everyday.

Table 4: Kindergarten Scheduling in Illinois Public Schools: 1980-81 to 1983-84

		Half-Day Everyday	All-Day Everyday	All-Day Alternate Days
Number of Districts:	1980-81	824	16	54
	1981-82	806	20	72
	1982-83	776	18	94
	1983-84	775	17	99
	(Net Change)	(-49)	(+1)	(+45)
Number of Schools:	1980-81	2,513	61	64
	1981-82	2,419	67	90
	1982-83	2,337	76	117
	1983-84	2,189	140	124
	(Net Change)	(-324)	(+79)	(+60)
Number of Students:	1980-81	127,651	3,870	2,418
	1981-82	123,860	4,132	3,293
	1982-83	126,154	4,813	4,589
	1983-84	117,457	9,777	4,987
	(Net Change)	(-10,194)	(+5,907)	(+2,569)

Source: Public School Fall Enrollment and Housing Report, Research and Statistics Section, Illinois State Board of Education.

Full-day everyday and full-day, alternate day kindergartens have increased from 1980-81 to 1983-84. They account for 12% of all kindergartens. While there were only 17 districts (2%) that had all-day, everyday kindergartens in 1983-84, there were 79 more schools (a total of 140 schools) and over

5,900 more students (a total of 9,777) using this type of scheduling than in 1980-81. These schools and students represent more than twice the number of schools and students using the all-day, everyday kindergartens in 1980-81. The increased number of schools with full-day, everyday kindergartens occurred primarily in Chicago and East St. Louis.

Nationally, Hymes (1985) reports that about one-third of the kindergarten children attended a full-day program in 1984. In Illinois, the number of districts, schools, and students with full-day, alternate day kindergarten scheduling nearly doubled from 1980-81 to 1983-84. They account for 10% of all kindergartens. Ninety-nine public school districts (11%), an increase of 45, operated all-day, alternate day kindergartens in 1983-84. These districts represented 124 schools, an increase of 60 schools, and 4,987 students, an increase of 2,569.

The decrease in the half-day kindergarten is not entirely explained by the increase in full-day, everyday and full-day, alternate day kindergartens. Declining enrollment and an increase in the use of nonpublic school kindergartens may also account for part of the decrease in the half-day, everyday schedule. Enrollments in nonpublic school kindergartens have increased 36% in the last four years.

District administrators who adopt an all-day, alternate day schedule believe that today's children are physically able to attend school all day without tiring and that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. The advantages include more time to address the needs of children, as well as reduced expenditures for mid-day transportation costs.

District administrators usually adopt an all-day, everyday schedule for one or both of the following reasons: to meet the needs of disadvantaged or educationally deficient students who can benefit from the extra services to prepare them for first grade, or to provide an enrichment program for advanced or gifted children who are ready for a more advanced program. It is argued that the all-day, everyday schedule provides longer periods of uninterrupted time for learning, more time to identify and address children's needs and interests, and more time for the development of social relationships. Because at least 50% of the kindergarten students have attended daycare centers or nursery schools, it is believed that most five-year-olds are ready for an all-day kindergarten program (Herman, 1984). An all-day experience also provides the benefit of more time to address the developmental and/or instructional needs of children whose experiences or development is below that of their age-mates.

Critics of the full-day schedule argue that most five-year-olds are not able to cope with an all-day schedule--that a half-day schedule is more appropriate for making the transition from home to school. Arguments against the full-day, everyday kindergarten include those presented against the full-day, alternate day schedule. Some children, it is argued, are not physically ready for a full-day program. They become too tired. Furthermore, if an all-day program is not varied and stimulating, kindergarten children become bored and experience dissatisfaction with their very first school experience (Herman, 1984).

Some critics fear that adoption of the full-day, everyday schedule is an attempt to push children into academics earlier, at a time when many children have not developed physically, socially, and/or emotionally enough to be able to succeed. There is concern that by ignoring the wide range in development of individual five-year-olds, more and more kindergarten children have experienced or will experience academic failure (Werner, 1984). The push to teach more, faster, and earlier ignores the realities of child growth and development (Judy, 1984). Finally, the all-day, everyday kindergarten costs more because of the additional expense of hiring extra teachers and possibly extra teacher aides.

Which of the kindergarten schedules, if any, is more effective? An extensive review of the research, particularly that of Stinard (1982), showed that there are academic advantages in the full-day, everyday kindergarten. Further, the full-day, alternate day schedule appears to have no detrimental academic effects on children when compared to the half-day, everyday schedule. In other reviews, the research is inconclusive in terms of demonstrating academic advantages of full-day schedules, although all cite individual studies showing improvement in readiness for students attending all-day programs.

There is a need to determine if certain groups of children might benefit from different types of kindergarten schedules, as well as a need to study kindergarten scheduling in relation to the many different types of objectives inherent in most kindergarten programs. These objectives include social, emotional, and physical development.

WHAT TYPES OF KINDERGARTEN CURRICULA ARE USED AND WHAT EFFECT DO THEY HAVE ON CHILDREN?

There is a consensus among current scholars in early childhood education that a major shift in the kindergarten curriculum has occurred during the past 15-20 years (Whitehurst, 1969; Federlein, 1984; Werner, 1984; Spodek, 1984; Dillingofski, 1984; and Gullikson, 1984). This shift has been from a developmental curriculum to a more academic-based curriculum. This trend is described in Spodek (1981) as follows:

> The concern for development in young children and for the creation of programs reflecting their needs and interests seems to be lessening. In its place can be found a concern for the achievement of specific learning goals. It seems as if the kindergarten is again being reconstituted, this time essentially as an extension downward of primary education. Thus, the change is from a concern for continuity of development to a concern for continuity of achievement.

As the first formal school experience for a child, the curriculum of the traditional kindergarten was generally described as child-centered. It emphasized learning-by-doing, natural experiences, and development of the "whole child" through free play. Teachers developed a curriculum which focused on the needs and interests of the child (Spodek, 1981). Because this curriculum is rooted in the principles of child development, it is called a developmentally oriented curriculum.

Kindergarten curriculum oriented toward the achievement of specific learning goals or emphasizing a downward extension of primary education is generally referred to as academic. Basic mechanics of academic skills are emphasized. In accordance with this method, imitation, drill, and association are used to teach language, reading, and arithmetic skills directly. Academic skills, rather than social and emotional development, are emphasized in this type of program.

There are other curriculum approaches. The Montessori approach, for example, is structured so that the child interacts with a prepared environment under the guidance of an instructor. Self-correcting materials are used by children in prescribed ways. The purpose is to help children develop sensory motor skills and ways of organizing sensory perceptions. Children are also taught skills of everyday living.

While all the various approaches support learning, different kinds of learning are supported to different degrees in each program. Similarly, all of the different approaches generally share similar goals (State Board of Education, 1980). These include providing support for the child's development and an orientation to the world of school; helping children develop knowledge about the physical and social world; developing physical, social and intellectual competence; and helping the child develop modes of self-expression.

The distinction between approaches is a matter of emphasis. These differences in emphasis, however, may have a significant influence on different kinds of learning and learners. Some children may perform well in an academic environment because their physical, social, and emotional development has progressed to a level sufficient for such learning. Others, whose development is at a different rate than their age peers, may be ready for a different set of experiences.

Table 5 shows the curriculum orientation for Illinois public and nonpublic kindergartens as of November 1984.

Table 5: Curriculum Orientation for Illinois Kindergartens

	Academic Orientation	Developmental Orientation	Total
Public	1,819 (90%)	198 (10%)	2,017
Nonpublic	530 (87%)	78 (13%)	608
Total	2,349 (89.8%)	276 (10.2%)	2,625

Source: Early Childhood Education Program Survey, October 1984.

More than 2,700 principals in Illinois elementary schools described their various kindergarten programs. Nearly 90% of both public and nonpublic kindergartens were described as having an academic orientation and 10% as developmental. These proportions represent a relatively recent shift in the emphasis of Illinois kindergarten programs. Approximately 61% of the responding principals indicated that the kindergarten curriculum had been modified within the last five years. Almost 46% of the changes represented adding curricular options as a response to perceived differences in the readiness between children with preschool experiences and children without such experiences. Only 35% of the principals indicated that no changes in the kindergarten curriculum have been implemented in the past five years. Another 5% anticipated changes in the near future.

Table 6: Reported Changes in Kindergarten Curriculum

Type of Change	Number	Percent
Modified Due to Readiness	949	31.5
Curricular Options Added Because of Readiness	424	14.1
Both Added and Modified	59	2.0
Modified for Other Reason	395	13.1
Curriculum Not Changed	1044	34.7
Not Changed, But Anticipated	139	4.6
No Response	211	- -

Source: Early Childhood Education Program Survey, October 1984.

The shift in emphasis from a developmental kindergarten curriculum to an academic curriculum has occurred for a number of reasons. First, kindergarten attendance has become the rule, rather than the exception. In the last 40 years, the percentage of five and six-year-old children in Illinois who were enrolled in school increased from 47% to approximately 90% (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1960 and 1980). As a result, those who develop elementary programs and educational materials give much more attention to the kindergarten curriculum, as kindergarten education has become the expected beginning point in school and, therefore, a focus for establishing continuity in school programs (Spodek, 1981).

A second influence is the increased societal pressure to provide academic instruction at an early age. According to Whitehurst (1969) and Federlein (1984), factors contributing to this pressure include increased criticism of American education, the "back to basics" movement, the advent of instructional television programs for young children, and the increased proportion of children attending organized preschool programs.

A third factor has been the increased use of standardized achievement and screening tests for kindergarten children. The use of these tests influences what is taught. Spodek (1981) states that the content of most standardized achievement tests in the early grades is on the mechanics of reading, language and arithmetic. Achievement scores on these tests are used to assess educational programs. Consequently, instruction tends to emphasize the knowledge required to do well on the tests (letter-sound associations, computation skills, spelling, punctuation), rather than higher order academic processes (comprehension, problem solving, or the application of principles to real problems).

A fourth factor has also been the learning processes of young children. The evidence implies that there is much that young children can learn prior to first grade. Piaget's work described the cognitive development of children as moving through stages, with each successive stage dependent upon successful progress through earlier stages. Hunt's research (1961) on intelligence and experience also implied that early experiences could have a major impact on the development of the intellect of children. Bloom (1964) analyzed test data on intelligence and demonstrated that what children learn early in life could affect later learning. Consequently, educational programs such as Head Start and Follow-Through were developed for young children. Another result of this research was greater emphasis on academics in kindergarten (Whitehurst, 1969; Spodek, 1981).

There is no substantive body of research which directly compares the academically oriented kindergarten curriculum with the developmentally oriented kindergarten curriculum on pupil outcome measures. Nevertheless, available research shows that children can learn a great deal prior to first grade, and some learning will not occur until a child is developmentally ready. There is general agreement among directors and teachers of early childhood education that the pressures of the academically oriented curriculum are a major contributor to failure and frustration among kindergarten pupils (Nall, 1984; Manz, 1984; Bantel, 1984; Werner, 1984, Federlein, 1984). For example, the Minneapolis school system last spring "flunked" 20% of its kindergarteners. In Ohio, a professor of early childhood education said that her department increasingly receives calls about the number of failures in kindergarten and first grade. Furthermore, available research does not demonstrate the superiority of an academically oriented curriculum in terms of long-term achievement (Spodek, 1981).

While agreeing that the evidence shows that there is much that young children could learn prior to first grade, Spodek (1981) argues that there has been no unanimity on the issue of what young children ought to learn during that period. Early childhood educators do not agree on what priorities ought to be given to the different learnings that are possible,

nor do they agree on what the long-term consequences of particular learnings are. Many believed that what was learned in kindergarten ought to support what was learned later in school or that the kindergarten curriculum ought to support that which seemed to be preparatory to later school learning. Yet, states Spodek, "there is no evidence that there are greater long-term payoffs for these kinds of learning activities than for activities more consistent with the growth ideology of the progressive kindergarten."

On placement of children as they enter American schools, Gillespie (1984) notes that "when a child shows signs of readiness, curriculum activities can be introduced with a reasonably high probability of success. By contrast. . .the introduction of traditional curriculum activities before the appearance of such signals is futile because neuromuscular maturation is insufficient to permit the child to profit from the learning experience."

David Elkind, author of The Hurried Child (1982), states that during childhood, children establish either a firm sense of industry or an abiding sense of failure. Children who are faced with demands to do math or read before they are ready may experience a series of failures which affect their self concept. Such failures may cause them to feel worthless. Elkind's point is that pushing academics onto children who do not have the requisite mental abilities not only causes early school failure, but may affect future learning because of poor self-concepts.

Hymes (1964) notes that stages of development cannot be skipped. To try to bypass them or to push them is to risk having children abhor learning. When children are asked to do school work which they cannot do because of a lack of development, the chances are increased that children will resist, resent, and reject what they could otherwise so easily learn later on.

In summary, research on the academic and the developmental kindergarten curricula generally states that an academic curriculum, if emphasized before children are ready, could be educationally harmful. This case is presented despite the fact that there is agreement among early childhood educators that some students can learn a great deal at a very early age. Little has been written about the advantages of an academic-oriented kindergarten, however. Early childhood educators, nevertheless, tend to agree that developmental kindergartens tend to be more appropriate for most children. Strom (1978) illustrates the American society's inclination to push children into academics by relating a story involving Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget.

> After completing a lecture term at Harvard University, the renowned authority on child development consented to reflect on his experiences in America. One of the newspaper reporters began, "Is it true, as Harvard's Jerome Bruner asserts, that if we try hard enough, we can teach almost any child at any age to do almost any task in some reasonable way?" Piaget's short reply was, "Only an American would ask." Indeed, in his later writings, he called this inquiry "The American Question."

Strom suggests that Piaget was justified in doubting the appropriateness of America's academic expectations for young children. He further suggests that American early childhood educators should change the focus of their inquiry from "What can children learn?" to "What kinds of learning are best during childhood?" Strom and others believe the shift in focus is overdue.

HOW IS CHRONOLOGICAL AGE USED IN DETERMINING COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE AND ELIGIBILITY TO ENTER SCHOOL?

Kindergartens and Compulsory Attendance

In many states, the compulsory school attendance age is one year later than the eligible age for kindergarten entry. In other states, children completing kindergarten at age six may be attending first grade with seven and eight-year-old children. Twenty-six states require first grade attendance at age six; in twenty-one other states, children must attend at age seven. In three states -- Arizona, Pennsylvania, and Washington -- children need not enter first grade until age eight, but may attend kindergarten at age five.

Slightly over one-half of the states mandate the provision of kindergarten programs. In states where provision is optional, most local districts do offer programs. Mississippi is the only state in which kindergarten programs are not offered at the present time. While a significant number of states have attempted to mandate kindergarten attendance, currently only Delaware, Florida and Louisiana require children to attend. In September 1985, attendance will become mandatory in Kentucky.

In Illinois, children must enroll in school by age seven and must be age five on or before December 1 to be eligible for kindergarten entry. There are no statewide laws or policies regarding screening for kindergarten entry. Local districts also determine criteria for promotion to first grade. The Illinois School Code provides authority for kindergarten regulations, but none have been developed.

Using Chronological Age in Determining Compulsory Attendance and Eligibility to Enter School

The School Code of Illinois requires that children between the ages of 7 and 16 shall attend school. During the Phase II study of mandates, particularly on compulsory attendance, the State Board of Education asked that of the age of entry into school be considered as a part of this Early Childhood Education policy study. As a result, age and other criteria used to determine entry into school were examined. The age at which Illinois children must be in attendance is seven, but they may begin first grade at six or kindergarten at five, if their birthdates are on or before December 1 of the school year.

Illinois is one of twenty-one states which have a compulsory attendance age of 7. Twenty-six states have 6 as a compulsory attendance age, and three require 8 year olds to be in school. In comparison with states that border or are near Illinois, Indiana and Iowa both require attendance at 7 and Wisconsin, Michigan, and Missouri require attendance at 6.

There are probably several reasons for differences between the compulsory attendance age and the age permitting entry into school First, the compulsory attendance statutes, of course, predate the provision of kindergarten. Second, the difference in ages at which children must attend and may attend permits flexibility in the parents' decision as to when the child is ready to begin formal instruction.

Historically, too, there are reasons for the difference. As stated in the Board's Compulsory Attendance Mandate Study, state and federal child labor laws developed between 1870 and 1910 were significant to the development of a compulsory attendance age. Various labor organizations supported compulsory attendance as a potentially effective instrument for the enforcement of child labor laws. According to McGee and Hills (1978):

> . . . the rulings on child labor of the later nineteenth century had been very clear about the age when children could work and the amount of prior schooling prerequisite to their work. At a time when it was an important part of the family income, child labor was forbidden until a certain age, and was limited to children who had completed a given amount of schooling. . . .Attempts to obtain the required amount of schooling prior to the permissive age of work produced a very real demand for entry into schooling at a specific age.

When Illinois elementary school principals were surveyed as to whether chronological age should be the sole criterion used to determine placement of children in kindergarten and first grade, slightly less than half agreed and slightly more than half disagreed (48.8% versus 51.2%). Public school elementary principals were slightly more likely to agree than were nonpublic school elementary principals (49.7% versus 46.4%).

As states vary somewhat in the age set for compulsory attendance, states vary considerably as to the age at which entry into school is permitted. Forty states set a specific date; and among those, there are seventeen different dates. Seven states allow local districts to make their own determinations. (See Table 7.)

Table 7: Kindergarten Entry Eligibility in the States

Specific Date for Entering School	Number of States
On/Before Aug. 31	2
Prior to Sept. 1	1
On/Before Sept. 1	10
On/Before Sept. 10	1
On/Before Sept. 15	2
On/Before Sept. 30	5
On/Before Oct. 1	3
On/Before Oct. 15	3
On/Before Oct. 16	1
On/Before Oct. 31	1
On/Before Nov. 1	1
On/Before Nov. 15	1
On/Before Dec. 1	3
4 years 9 mo. by Sept. 1 (equates to on/before Dec. 1)	1
On/Before Dec. 15	2
On/Before Dec. 31	1
On/Before Jan. 1	2
4 years 8 mo. by beginning school year	1
Local District Option	7
No Minimum Age	1
Unknown Policy	1

Source: Education Commission of the States, "State Characteristics: Kindergartens, 1984."

McGee and Hills (1978) noted that historical data do not establish a clear, rational "right age" for school entry. They stated that formal schooling developed in response to society's social, economic, and political needs as changes occurred in the family's ability to prepare children for adult life. Different countries have set various entry ages in response to these perceived societal needs. McGee and Hills also stated that entry age in the United States was, most likely, set pragmatically, just as the school year was set to meet the needs of an agricultural society in which children helped during the growing and harvesting seasons or as the school day was set to allow time before and after school for chores.

Chronological age is used as a criterion for determining school entry, even though it is of limited educational value, because it clearly establishes when the state must provide education services and is administratively convenient. Among children of the same chronological age, development and mental age can vary considerably. Even within the individual child, the rates for intellectual, emotional, social, and physical development are not the same.

Perspectives on Age as a Criterion for Initial School Entry

There appears to be at least two distinct perspectives on determining when it is appropriate for children to be enrolled in kindergarten. The first perspective is to delay the entry of the child into kindergarten until the child can reasonably be expected to perform the tasks typical of kindergarten. The second perspective is to enroll the child when the child reaches a certain age and then provide the educational program which can reasonably be expected to successfully meet the child's needs. Both perspectives acknowledge that a child's developmental age may be different from the chronological age. However, the perspectives treat these differences differently. Lilian G. Katz, Director of the Early Childhood Education Clearinghouse, University of Illinois, defines developmental age as "a point in a sequence of changes from less to more mature behavior in any given realm of human functioning that may or may not be related to chronological age." Generally, a child's developmental age is described in terms of behavior most appropriate to the norm of a given age group. For example, a child's chronological age may be seven, but his or her physical development may be typical of that of most five-year-olds. Hence, the physical developmental age is considered to be five.

Delaying the Child's Entrance into School

This perspective holds that chronological age is not sufficient to determine whether a child is ready to be successful in school; hence, the enrollment of a child under the compulsory attendance age should be delayed until the child can perform certain mental, social-emotional, and physical tasks which have been determined to be typical of expectations in kindergarten. It is recognized that children who are chronologically eligible to attend school may not be developmentally ready to perform school tasks successfully. The parent of a child judged "not ready for school" is generally encouraged to delay the child's entrance into kindergarten for a year or to enroll the child in a nonpublic preschool. One school refers to this practice of delay as "redshirting the youngster."

The belief is expressed that children are not harmed if their enrollment is delayed, and thus, it is better to err on the side of waiting. Haines, Ames and Gillespie (1980) sum up this position:

> We would like to see girls fully 5, boys 5 1/2 before they start kindergarten; girls fully 6 and boys 6 1/2 before first grade....Children younger than this should be carefully screened to make sure that they are ready for kindergarten (or first grade) even when the law permits earlier entrance.

Entering the regular school program too young is thought by these proponents to cause problems or even school failure. It is believed that if the entry of children who are behind their cohorts in development cannot be delayed (i.e., they have reached compulsory attendance age), then they should be placed in developmental programs.

There are indications that many kindergarten teachers believe that children should be at least five before starting school and that older children will do better. Peterson and Ayabe (1982) reported that 90% of the Mesa, Arizona kindergarten teachers surveyed expressed the belief that children should only be allowed to enter kindergarten if they were five years old by September 1. A similar belief was reflected in a report to an Illinois school board which noted that the kindergarten teachers' and administrators' concerns about the kindergarten program led to the recommendations of preschool screening and, eventually, to the policy that the age for entering school in that district be raised to five by September 1 (Crete-Monee, 1983). The assumption is that the older the child is on entrance into school, the more likely the child will be successful in performing the required tasks.

Thus, in this approach, the child must be ready for the demands of formal schooling and should be delayed in entering the school program until the child is ready. The child must accommodate to the school's expectations.

Enrolling the Child in School at a Certain Age

Advocates of this perspective believe that the school should be ready for the child, not the converse. It is assumed that a child is always ready to learn and that there are no problems if the learning environment is appropriate for the child. It is considered the role of the school to help the child to develop the skills needed for school success. Egertson (1983), a kindergarten teacher, expressed this view:

> When kindergarten was for 5-year-olds, no one worried whether children could sit still for long periods of time -- the classroom was organized so they could move around and select from a wide variety of activities. No one worried whether they had long attention spans -- they weren't expected to sit and listen to the teacher for long stretches ... no one worried, either, whether children could count to 20, say their ABC's.... It was expected that the school would teach them in good time. And no one worried about eye-hand coordination or auditory and visual memory. The materials and equipment were designed to help these emerge.... Some kindergarten teachers now do not even provide a time in the day [for reading to children, although] there is a high correlation between being read to as a young child and having, later, a disposition to read.

These advocates consider developmental age to be important, but they do not believe that the solution to the problem of developmentally delayed children (children whose developmental age is less than their chronological age) is to delay the entry of those children into school. Rather, they believe the school's role is to take children where they are and address their individual needs through appropriate programming. One early childhood director from a large school district in Illinois agreed that there are many

children who are immature when they are of the legal age to enter kindergarten. However, she said she believes that these children should begin school so that they can be given opportunities to learn the skills that they need for school and that keeping them out would only compound the problem.

Gredler (1980) spoke to the practice of retaining a child in kindergarten who is judged unready for first grade. His point is equally relevant for determining school-entry levels for children.

> One of my main points is that the child who is scheduled for retention does not just need time to mature ... but needs an active, ongoing program that is pointed toward the specific educational problems diagnosed. If a diagnostic-prescriptive program is needed for the learning disabled child, why suspend all judgment for the unready child and say instead that he just needs another year of kindergarten.

From this perspective, children should be allowed to enter school when they are eligible and placed in programs which will address their needs. In this approach, the school accommodates to the child's needs when the child is determined eligible to receive publicly funded services.

Numerous studies have been conducted on factors which are or were thought to be associated with predicting initial academic success of children entering kindergarten or first grade--and thus, could be used for entry criteria. These factors have included chronological age, developmental age, birth month of children, gender, socioeconomic status, intelligence, preschool experience, and social adjustment (Beattie, 1970; Wood, Powell, and Knight, 1984; Hedges, 1977; Grealer, 1978; Hebbler, 1981; Rubin, 1975; Osterlind, 1982; McKinnon, 1982; Larson, 1983; Creech, 1982; Hammond and Skipper, 1962; Griffith, Villanueva, and Fisher, n.d.; Di Pasquale, Moule, and Flewelling, 1980; Diamond, 1983).

In summary, no sole criterion was found to be the best predictor or indicator of later school success. Most of the research found somewhat higher mean achievement for older children than for younger children, but satisfactory achievement for the majority of all children. Other factors associated with predicting success were sex, socioeconomic status, intelligence, preschool experiences, and social adjustment. In addition, the month in which children were born was also used as a predictor of success. Usually, younger children in an age cohort were found more likely to have academic problems than their older classmates. However, the birth months differed in different studies so useful generalization was not possible.

Most of the research literature found somewhat higher mean achievement levels for older children than for younger children in the early grades, but also found, at least, satisfactory achievement for the majority of younger children. Studies which compare achievement of early and late entrants usually use teacher's grades in the same class or the same standardized test

with the same grade level's normative scale. It is unreasonable to expect the younger children to be equal in maturity and previous experience to those almost a full year older. It is also unreasonable to expect these older children not to score higher on the same test than younger children, especially when the comparison groups have been matched on intelligence scores.

Illinois State Board of Education data indicate that many children, especially minority children, who are in need of specialized educational services are not being served until they enter school, even though they are eligible for services at age 3. The research evidence demonstrates the desirability of early educational services to certain handicapped children.

For children who are not privileged to have experiences which would help them to acquire the skills needed for school success, it would be detrimental to delay their entry into school. Such a delay would certainly not help them to acquire needed skills, but would, instead, result in a further discrepancy between their experiences and those of more advantaged children. Limited-English-speaking children would not be likely to acquire English language skills by waiting a year to begin school.

ADDITIONAL PERSPECTIVES SPANNING PRE-KINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS

This section provides information from three additional perspectives which span pre-kindergarten and kindergarten programs and services. These perspectives are:

- The numbers and types of early childhood education programs operated by public and nonpublic schools,
- The qualifications of administrators and teachers in early childhood education programs,
- The attitudes of Illinois elementary principals on selected early childhood education issues.

Early Childhood Education Programs in Illinois Schools

What early childhood education programs are being offered to Illinois children through its public and nonpublic schools? From the Early Childhood Education Program Survey, a total of 1,269 programs were identified and described. Of this total, 608 or 47.9% were offered through public schools and 661 or 52.1% were offered through nonpublic schools.

Table 8: Numbers and Types of Early Childhood Education Programs Operated by Public and Nonpublic Schools

Type of Program	Public	Nonpublic	Total
Transitional	41	12	53
Childcare	7	49	56
Latchkey	17	37	54
Preschool	166	354	520
All-day Kindergarten	143	123	266
All-day Alternate Kindergarten	63	14	77
Head Start	102	6	108
Other	69	66	135
Totals	608	661	1269

Source: Early Childhood Education Program Survey, October 1984.

Collectively, these public and nonpublic programs serve a reported 47,068 children ranging in age from 1 year 6 months to 14 years. Of these, 27,700 are served in public school programs and 19,368 in nonpublic school programs. Elementary school principals indicated that another 13,310 children (an additional 28%) were on waiting lists and not being served.

Approximately 25% of these programs (322) were described as academically oriented, approximately 18% (229) were described as developmentally oriented, and the remainder (700) were characterized as encompassing both academic and developmental curricula. Chronological age was the most commonly specified admission criterion (91%), while screening and evaluation results were reported to be used as criteria in 23% of the programs. Approximately 68% of the programs rely upon teacher evaluations as an exit criterion and 61% use chronological age as an exit criterion.

Within each type or kind of program, there is substantial variation in the eligible age ranges of children, the number of children served, the number and kinds of staff employed, and the program schedule or calendars.

Staff in Early Childhood Education Programs

In the survey of elementary principals, details were requested concerning qualifications of the administrators and teachers in early childhood programs. Both public and nonpublic principals were queried.

According to the responses of elementary principals themselves, elementary school principals in Illinois, in general, have little or no teaching experience at the pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, or primary grade levels. Proportionately more nonpublic elementary school principals have teaching experience in the pre-K to grade three range than do public school principals. Table 9 displays the numbers of principals who indicated one or more years of teaching experience at each of the grade levels. Fewer than

22% of the 2,526 public elementary school principals indicated any prior teaching experience at or below the third grade, while 42% of the nonpublic elementary school principals indicated some teaching experience at or below the third-grade level.

Table 9: Teaching Experience of Illinois Elementary School Principals

Grade Level	Public		Nonpublic	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Pre-Kindergarten	81	3.2%	117	12.1%
Kindergarten	217	8.6%	172	17.8%
Grade 1	360	14.3%	344	35.6%
Grade 2	417	16.5%	343	35.5%
Grade 3	543	21.5%	400	41.4%
Grades 4 to 8	2084	82.5%	734	76.0%
Grades 9 to 12	791	31.3%	213	22.0%

Source: Early Childhood Education Program Survey, October 1984.

Nearly 60% of the public school principals and almost 63% of the nonpublic school principals indicated they have attended workshops that focused primarily on the development of children below the age of eight years. Twenty-six percent of the public school principals and about 33% of the nonpublic school principals also indicated they had completed one or more formal courses dealing with the development of children below age eight within the last ten years. Approximately 10% of public school principals and 8.9% of nonpublic school principals indicated that they have had no formal coursework but would be interested in taking a course. There were also 14% of public school principals and 10.5% of nonpublic school principals who indicated that they have not attended a workshop on this topic but would be interested in so doing.

Table 10: Formal Coursework and Workshop Experience of Illinois Elementary School Principals

Type	Public School Principals		Nonpublic School Principals	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Formal Coursework	657	26.0%	314	32.5%
No Formal Coursework	1164	46.0%	415	43.0%
No Coursework but Interested in Coursework	261	10.3%	86	8.9%
Workshops	1510	59.8%	606	62.7%
No Workshops	469	18.6%	166	17.2%
No Workshops but Interested in Workshops	353	14.0%	101	10.5%

Source: Early Childhood Education Program Survey, October 1984.

As shown in Table 11, teachers in early childhood education programs, excluding those in preschool handicapped programs, may hold one of several certificates.

Table 11: Teaching Certificates for Teachers in Early Childhood Education Programs, Pre-K through 3

Type of Certificate	Grade Level Certificated
Early Childhood	To age 6, excluding K
Standard Elementary	K-9
Transitional Bilingual	K-12
Provisional Elementary	K-9

These types of teaching certificates that are valid for teaching in the early childhood education programs, essentially pre-kindergarten through third grade, are required only when the program is at or beyond the kindergarten level and/or is funded through state or federal sources with specific certification requirements. For example, teachers who are assigned to a Chapter I (federal) preschool program would have to hold an appropriate

elementary certificate in order to qualify for that source of funding. The statutes do not require a pre-kindergarten teacher in a public school to have a teaching certificate. Local districts may require certification as a condition of employment. Certification is only valid for public school employment within the K-12 grade structure. Excluding preschool programs for the handicapped child, other programs for pre-kindergarten children are not legally required to employ a certified teacher. Below the kindergarten level, there is no specific certification requirement for teachers other than those listed previously. Chicago public schools have their own early childhood certificates.

In Illinois, there are differences in the minimum requirements for early childhood education teaching certificates and elementary teaching certificates. For a standard elementary certificate, 16 semester hours of professional education credits are required, two of which must be in educational psychology (including human growth and development) and two of which must be in history and/or philosophy of education. To be eligible for an early childhood education certificate, however, 22 semester hours of professional education credits are required, three of which must be in child growth and development with emphasis on the young child and three of which must be in history and philosophy of early childhood education. In addition, candidates for an early childhood certificate must have six hours of credit in instructional methods (as opposed to two hours of credit for an elementary certificate), two hours of credit in health and nutrition for the young child, and three hours of credit in child, family, and community relationships (State Board of Education, 1983).

Additional differences between requirements for earning a standard elementary certificate and an early childhood certificate in Illinois also exist. A candidate for an elementary certificate must have two hours of credit in methods of teaching reading, must have pre-student teaching clinical experiences equivalent to 100 clock hours, and must complete five hours of student teaching at a grade level between kindergarten and 9th grade. Early childhood education candidates must complete five hours of practicum in a preschool. All additional requirements for elementary and early childhood certificates are similar (State Board of Education, 1983).

Since 1974, approximately 2,000 Early Childhood Education certificates have been issued, excluding certificates issued by the Chicago Board of Examiners. Data are not available to determine the proportion of publicly employed pre-kindergarten teachers who hold Early Childhood Certificates or other specific certificates.

Of the 661 early childhood programs reported by nonpublic elementary school principals, 500 were staffed with one or more certificated teachers. Similarly, of the 608 early childhood education programs reported by public school principals, 544 were staffed by one or more certificated teachers.

Volunteer Staff

Volunteer staff are typically parents who participate in their children's programs in some manner. Nonpublic school elementary principals reported that 55 full-time and 569 part-time volunteers participated in their 661

programs. Public school elementary principals reported that 260 full-time and 3,041 part-time volunteers participated in their 608 programs. Thus, nonpublic school programs have an approximate ratio of one volunteer for each group of 31 students. Public school programs have an approximate ratio of one volunteer for each group of eight students.

Attitudes of Illinois Elementary Principals on Selected Issues

Illinois principals were asked in October 1984 their opinions of the public schools' offering certain early childhood education programs if costs were not a factor: latchkey services; all-day kindergartens; pre-kindergarten programs for children, 3-5 years; child care and educational experiences for infants and children below 3 years; parent education programs; and how some of these programs should be funded.

Table 12 shows the responses of Illinois principals. There was substantial agreement between the public and nonpublic school elementary principals. For the most part, the principals did not support latchkey services (26.8%); full-day kindergartens (38.1%); pre-kindergarten programs for children 3-5 (49.9%); daycare programs for children under three (9.5%); or providing daycare or preschool services at no cost to parents (21.6%).

Illinois elementary school principals did agree that the public schools should be allowed to charge tuition for childcare and preschool programs, based on the parents' ability to pay (66.6%). They also agreed that public schools should offer parent education programs for teenage and adult parents (78.1%).

Public and nonpublic school principals disagreed somewhat with each other, relative to latchkey services, parent education, and charging tuition. A greater proportion of nonpublic school principals -- though not a majority -- supported latchkey services (37.6% versus 22.8%). A greater proportion of nonpublic elementary principals also supported parent education programs for teenage and adult parents (84.8% versus 75.5%) and permitting the public schools to charge tuition for childcare and preschool programs (76.3% versus 62.9%).

A sample of principals who indicated that they were opposed to all-day kindergarten was contacted for clarification of their reasons. Almost a fourth (23.5%) indicated that they no longer oppose such programs or that they oppose them as the only type of program. Another fourth (23.5%) opposed them only on the basis of cost; 7.8% cited both educational concerns and cost as reasons for their opposition.

Table 12: Opinions of Illinois Elementary Principals Concerning the Public School's Providing Selected ECE Services

(Percent Agreeing that Public Schools Should Offer)

Service	Public School Principals	Nonpublic School Principals	% Total
1. Latchkey Public schools should operate before and after-school child-care services for all school age children who need them.	22.8	37.6	26.8
2. Full Day Kindergarten Public schools should operate full-day kindergarten.	40.2	33.1	38.1
3. Preschool Public schools should operate a pre-kindergarten program for children between 3-5.	49.6	50.5	49.9
4. Child Care Public schools should offer child care and educational experiences to infants and children below 3 years.	9.8	8.7	9.5
5. Parent Education Public schools should offer parent education programs for teenage and adult parents.	75.5	84.8	78.1
6. Funding Public schools should be allowed to charge tuition for child-care and preschool programs based on parents' ability to pay.	62.9	76.3	66.6
7. Funding Public schools should provide any child-care or preschool services provided at no cost to parents.	23.5	16.6	21.6

Source: Early Childhood Education Program Survey, October 1984.

STATE AND FEDERAL INITIATIVES

The increasing importance of education for young children is recognized by state legislatures and is being considered by Congress. There is a trend toward states' mandating or providing educational services for children younger than compulsory attendance ages.

Slightly over one-half of the states mandate the provision of kindergarten programs, as Illinois does. In states where provision is optional, most local districts offer programs. Mississippi is the only state in which kindergarten programs are not offered at the present time. While significant numbers of states have attempted to mandate kindergarten attendance, currently only Delaware, Florida and Louisiana require children to attend. In September 1985, attendance will become mandatory in Kentucky (Source: ISBE Survey, 1985).

Some states have already taken initiative in the development and availability of preschool services for children. For example, public schools in Michigan are providing a variety of preschool programs in a substantial proportion of schools: Pre-Kindergarten (4 years old), 38%; Readiness-Kindergarten (5 years old), 33%: Pre-First Grade (Kindergarten graduates not ready for First Grade), 21%. The Vermont legislature will consider various cooperative arrangements with non-school groups, such as contracting for preschool services. In the State of Washington, an educational task force has recommended that the State fund preschool programs for all disadvantaged children. Massachusetts is considering legislation which would require local districts to offer both preschool programs and programs between kindergarten and first grade for those children who had difficulty in kindergarten. These examples of early childhood initiatives in other states are not comprehensive, but illustrate the varying approaches being taken in the states.

Since the establishment of Head Start in 1965, the federal government has continuously provided financial support for this program and provided funds for related programs such as Home Start and Follow-Through for several years. Home Start was funded for three years and emphasized the training of parents in their respective homes. Follow-Through, which is also no longer funded, provided supplemental programs to Head Start children in grades 1-3 (Cyran and Surbeck, 1979).

Federal funding of Head Start has had a consistent pattern of steadily increasing appropriations. Congress appropriated $96.4 million for the initial year of the program. The following year appropriations had more than doubled to $198.9 million. Seven years later, in 1973, federal funding for Project Head Start had again more than doubled to $400.7 million. The largest increase in federal funding occurred during the Carter Administration. Between fiscal years 1977 and 1978, appropriations jumped from $475 million to $625 million (Williams, 1983).

By 1983, federal funding had reached $912 million. Although the Reagan Administration made cuts in the federal government's social and educational programs, the importance of Project Head Start had been recognized; Congress approved an additional $74 million over the previous year (Williams, 1983).

Despite continued federal support, there were only 18% low percentage of children nationally being served by Project Head Start as compared to the number of eligible children (Hymes, 1985). This demonstrates that there has simply not been enough money appropriated to make programs available for all eligible children.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The policy study of early childhood in Illinois showed that although programs for young children have been emerging since around the turn of the century, the significant changes in American society during the past decade have greatly accelerated the public's interest in and concerns about such programs. Specifically, the study resulted in the following major findings.

- There are a variety of early childhood programs being offered in response to increased expectations of children, increased demand by parents, and recognition of the greater range of differences among children entering school.

- The number of children who could benefit from early childhood programs far exceeds those currently being served. This is particularly true for those who are most at risk of school failure: children from low-income families, limited-English-proficient children, and children of teenage parents.

- Research has indicated that early childhood programs can be successful in meeting desirable educational and social objectives. Economic analyses show a seven-to-one return on an investment in a high-quality preschool program.

- The expectations previously held for first-grade students are now being expected of kindergarten students. This is due to the large incidence of children already having had preschool experiences and the demand for acquiring basic skills as soon as possible. This is a source of controversy.

- Conditions which established the lower compulsory age as age 7 have changed significantly. There seems to be no reason for a difference between the age at which a child <u>may</u> attend school and the age at which a child <u>must</u> attend school.

- Changing the date at which children may enter school does not address the range of differences among children.

- The full-day, everyday kindergarten has superior academic benefits to the half-day, everyday and full-day, alternate day programs.

- The training and experience of elementary school principals typically has not encompassed the needs of young children. Most of the principals had teaching experiences limited to intermediate and upper grades.

0800j

APPENDIX A

Consultants Meeting with the Early Childhood Education Task Force

1. Sue Larson
   Head Start Director
   Springfield Community Action Council
   Springfield

2. Faye Lee
   Director
   Step-by-Step Learning Center
   Springfield

3. Velma Thomas
   Director of Early Childhood Projects
   Chicago Board of Education District 299
   Chicago

4. Dorothy Kellberg
   Chapter One Administrator
   Chicago Board of Education District 299
   Chicago

5. Barbara Bowman
   Past President of National Association for the
   Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
   Chicago

6. Eileen Borgia
   CDA Credential Training
   Springfield

7. Mary Forney and Staff
   Family Service Day Care Center
   Springfield

8. David Weikart
   President
   High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
   Ypsilanti, Michigan

9. Mildred Winter
   Director, Early Childhood Education
   Missouri Department of Education
   Jefferson City, Missouri

10. Jack Pfeiffer
    Director, Lawrence Adult Education Center
    Springfield

11. Lilian Katz
    Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary
     and Early Childhood Education and
    Professor of Early Childhood Education
    University of Illinois
    Champaign

12. Sue Howell
    Chief
    Office of Child Development
    Department of Children and Family Services
    Springfield

13. Lana Hostetler
    Lincoln Land Community College
    Springfield

Team Visits

Champaign-Urbana
    Merle Karnes Preschool Programs
    Montessori School
    All-Day Everyday Kindergarten
    Child Development Center - University of Illinois

Chicago
    Head Start in the Public Schools
    Bilingual
    All-Day Programming
    Child-Parent Center
    Magnet Preschool

SELECTED REFERENCES

Bantel, E. Early Childhood Education Department, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan. (Telephone Interview) May, 1984.

Beattie, C. Entrance Age to Kindergarten and First Grade: Its Effect on Cognitive and Affective Development of Students. ED 133 050.

Bereiter, C. & Engelman, S. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bloom, B. Stability and Changes in Human Characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964. Cited in Spodek, Bernard. The Kindergarten: A Retrospective and Contemporary View. ED 206 375, 1981.

Bronfenbrenner, U. A Report on Longitudinal Evaluations of Preschool Programs. Publication No. 74-25. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1974.

Bureau of the Census. Detailed Population Characteristics: Illinois, 1980 Census of the Population. PC 80-1-015. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Chattin-McNichols, J. "The Effects of Montessori School Experience." Young Children, Vol. 36, No. 5, July, 1981.

Clarke, A. "Early Experience and Cognitive Development." Review of Research in Education, Vol. 11, 1984.

Creech, C. W. The Relationship between Preschool Experiences and Reading Achievement: A Five Year Followup Study. Durham, North Carolina: North Carolina Central University, Department of Education. ED 224 601, 1982.

Crete-Monee Board of Education. Information Report 6-F: The Kindergarten Report, Crete, Illinois. (Unpublished Paper) February, 1983.

Cryan, J. R. & Surbeck, E. Early Childhood Education: Foundations for Lifelong Learning. Bloomington, Indiana: The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1979.

Cummins, J. "Tests, Achievement, and Bilingual Students," FOCUS 9, February, 1982.

Department of Health and Human Services. Chapter XIII, Subchapter B, (Head Start Regulations). Washington, D.C., 1983.

DiPasquale, G. W.; Moule, A. D. & Flewelling, R. W. "The Birthdate Effect." Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 13, 1980.

Diamond, G. H. "The Birthdate Effect--A Maturational Effect?" Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 16, 1983.

Doss, D. and Others. Interim Evaluation Report: 1979 Summer School Program. Austin Independent School District. ED 188 823. 1979.

Education Commission of the States. "State Characteristics: Kindergartens." Clearinghouse Notes. Denver, Colorado, 1984.

The Encyclopedia of Education. Vol. 3, United States of America: The Macmillan Company and the Free Press, 1971.

Egertson, H. "Kindergarten: It Should Be (But Isn't) for Five-Year-Olds." Speaking for Children, January/February, 1983.

Elkind, D. The Hurried Child. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1982, cited in Gillespie, Barbara. "Developmental Placement in American Schools." (Unpublished Report) 1984.

Federlein, A. C. "Kindergarten - To Read or Not to Read." Eastern Educational Journal, Vol. 16, No. 2, Winter, 1984.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr.; Lincoln, R. & Menken, J. (Eds). Teenage Sexuality, Pregnancy, and Childbearing. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

Gillespie, B. "Developmental Placement in American Schools." (Unpublished Report) 1984.

Gredler, G. R. "A Look at Some Important Factors in Assessing Readiness for School." Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 11, 1978.

Gredler, G. R. "The Birthdate Effect: Fact or Artifact? Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 13, 1980.

Griffith, R. B.; Villanueva, L. E. & Fisher, J. R. The Relationship Between Birth Month and the Frequency of Psychological Evaluation. (Unpublished Paper) No Date.

Haines, J., Ames, L. B., & Gillespie, C. The Gesell Preschool Test Manual. Lumberville, Pennsylvania: Modern Learning Press, 1980.

Hammond, S. L. & Skipper, D. S. "Factors Involved in the Adjustment of Children Entering First Grade." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 56, 1962.

Head Start Bureau. Head Start Policy Manual: Head Start Program Performance Standards. Washington, D.C., 1975.

Head Start Bureau. Head Start: A Child Development Program. Washington, D.C, 1983 (a).

Head Start Bureau. Head Start Enrollment. Washington, D.C., 1983 (b).

Head Start Bureau. Project Head Start Statistical Fact Sheet. Washington, D.C., 1984.

Head Start Bureau, Region V. Report on Head Start Enrollment and Funding Levels as of October 1, 1984. Chicago, Illinois, 1984.

Hebbler, K. M. Do Older Kindergarteners Have an Advantage: The Importance of Month of Birth When Starting School. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April, 1981.

Hedges, W. D. When Should Parents Delay Entry of Their Child into the First Grade? Gainsville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc., 1976.

Herman, B. E. The Case of the All-Day Kindergarten. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1984.

Huber, J., "Homes Unoccupied By Day: Causes and Consequences," University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, (Unpublished Paper) 1982.

Hunt, J. M. Intelligence and Experience. New York: Ronald Press, 1961. Cited in Spodek, Bernard. The Kindergarten: A Retrospective and Contemporary View. ED 206 375, 1981.

Hymes, J. The Children Under Six. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1964. Cited in Gillespie, Barbara. "Developmental Placement in American Schools." (Unpublished Paper) 1984.

Hymes, J. Early Childhood Education: The Year in Review -- A Look at 1984. Carmel, California: Hacienda Press, 1985.

Illinois State Board of Education. Early Childhood Education in Illinois: Focus on Kindergarten. Springfield, Illinois, 1980.

Illinois State Board of Education. Minimum Requirements for State Certificates. Springfield, Illinois, 1983.

Judy, J. "Here We Come, Ready or Not!" Illinois School Research and Development. Vol. 20, Spring, 1984.

Karnes, M. Research and Development Program on Preschool Disadvantaged Children. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969.

Karnes, M. B., (Ed.) The Underserved: Our Young Gifted Children. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1983.

Katz, L. G., Director. ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education, Urbana, Illinois. (Personal Communication) February, 1985.

Larsen, J. M. Effects of Preschool on Educationally Advantaged Children: Implication for Program Planning. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, Department of Family Sciences. ERIC ED 241 158, 1983.

Larsen, J. Effects of Preschool on Educationally Advantaged Children: Implication for Program Planning. ERIC ED 241 158, 1983.

Lazar, I. "Early Intervention Is Effective." Educational Leadership, Vol. 38, January, 1981.

Lazar, I. & Darlington, R. Lasting Effects after Preschool. Summary Report. Publication No. 80-30179. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1979.

Manz, M. Signal Hill School District 181, Belleville, Illinois, (Personal Communication) July, 1984.

McGee, M. & Hills, T. When Should Schooling Begin? Paper No. 3 - Policy Studies of the Early Childhood Planning Project. Trenton, New Jersey: Office of Planning Services, New Jersey State Department of Education, 1978.

McKinnon, J.; Flieger, S. & Patterson, M. A Comparative Study of the Effects of Preschool Education on Middle-Class Children. Puce, Ontario: Lakeside Montessori School. ERIC ED 221 179, 1982.

Nall, S. Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Illinois, (Personal Communication) July, 1984.

Naron, N. K. "The Need for Full-Day Kindergarten." Educational Leadership, January, 1981.

National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics. Make Something Happen: Hispanics and Urban High School Reform. Hispanic Policy Development Project: New York. No Date.

New York State Education Department. Evaluation of the New York State Experimental Prekindergarten Program. Final Report. Bethesda, Maryland: ED 219 123, 1982.

Nieman, R. & Gastright, J. "The Long-Term Effects of Title I Preschool and All-Day Kindergarten." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 63, November, 1981.

O'Connell, M. & Rogers, C. "Out-of-Wedlock Births, Premarital Pregnancies and Their Effect on Family Formation and Dissolution." Family Planning Perspectives, 16, July/August, 1984.

Oppel, W. & Royston, A. "Teenage Births: Some Social, Psychological, and Physical Sequelae." American Journal of Public Health, 61, April 1971.

Osterlind, S. J. "Preschool Impact on Children: Its Sustaining Effects into Kindergarten." ERQ, Winter, 1980-81.

Peterson, S. & Ayabe, C. Kindergarten Age Requirements: Mesa Public Schools Research and Evaluation Tech Memo. Mesa, Arizona: Mesa Public Schools, 1982.

Randel, J. & Elovson, A. Follow-Up Study of School Children and Families Enrolled in San Diego Home Start During Their Preschool Years. ED 164 131, 1978.

Ross, E. D. The Kindergarten Crusade. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1976.

Rubin, R. Sex Differences in Effects of Kindergarten Attendance on Development of School Readiness and Language Skills. Research Report No. 10. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Minneapolis University Research, Development and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children, 1975.

Rutter, M. "School Effects on Pupil Progress: Research Findings and Policy Implications." Child Development, Vol. 54, 1983.

Schweinhart, L. & Weikart, D. Young Children Grow Up: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 15. Ypsilanti, Michigan: High/Scope Press, 1980.

Schweinhart, L. & Weikart, D. "Perry Preschool Effects Nine Years Later: What Do They Mean?" In M. Begab, H. Haywood, and H. Garber (Eds.) Psychosocial Influences in Retarded Performance. Vol. 2, Baltimore, Maryland: University Park Press, 1981.

Schweinhart, L.; Weikart, D. & Others. Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 19. Ypsilanti, Michigan: High/Scope Press, 1984.

Schweinhart, L. & Weikart, D. The Ypsilanti Preschool Curriculum Demonstration Project. Ypsilanti, Michigan: High/Scope Press, 1978.

Scott, K. G.; Field, T. & Robertson, E. (Eds.) Teenage Parents and Their Offspring. New York: Brune and Stratton, 1981.

Scruggs, J. Florida Migratory Child Compensatory Program Evaluation, FY 1977. Florida State Department of Education. ED 156 387, 1977.

Smilansky, M. Priorities in Education: Pre-School, Evidence and Conclusions. Working Paper No. 323. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1979.

Spodek, B. The Kindergarten: A Retrospective and Contemporary View. ED 206 375, 1981.

Strom, Robert D. Growing Together, Parent and Child Development. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1978.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, "1980 Census of Population." Vol. 1., Chap. D, Part 15, Illinois PC 80-1-D15, Table 202. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. November, 1983.

U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population, Vol. 1, Pt. 15, Sec. 1.

U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, Vol. 1, Pt. 15, Secs. 1, 2.

U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, Vol. 1, Pt. 15, Sec. 1.

Van Diem, J. "Preliminary Report of the Working Parents and Achieving Children Conference." The Home and School Institute, Washington, D.C., 1984.

Vopava, J. & Royce, J. Comparison of the Long-Term Effects of Infant and Preschool Programs on Academic Performance. ED 152 428, 1978.

Weikart, D. Longitudinal Results of the Ypsilanti Perry Preschool Project. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1970.

Weikart, D. High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Michigan. (Personal Communication) February, 1985.

Werner, L. "A View of Today's Kindergartens across the United States." Illinois School Research and Development. Vol. 20, Spring, 1984.

Whitehurst, K. E. Early Formal Instruction: What Constitutes Too Much Pressure?" Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association on Children Under Six, Jacksonville, Florida, April, 1969. ED 099 111, 1969.

Williams, J. T. Give More Children a Head Start. United States of America: Children's Defense Fund, 1983.

Wood, C.; Powell, S. & Knight, R. C. "Predicting School Readiness: The Validity of Developmental Age." Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 17, 1984.

Zigler, E. & Cascione, R. "On Being a Parent." Parenthood in a Changing Society. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education, 1980.

0800j

Illinois State Board of Education

100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Walter W. Naumer, Jr., Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

Ted Sanders
State Superintendent of Education

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois
July 1985 6M 6-328-86 Program No. 309

Appendix B

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM SURVEY
of Illinois Schools

The State Board of Education is currently conducting a study of early childhood education in Illinois. As a part of the study, a survey instrument was developed to obtain baseline data regarding early childhood education programs within the public and nonpublic schools of Illinois and to assess the opinions of public and nonpublic school principals regarding early childhood education issues. The data will be used in providing a description of the current situation.

The survey instrument is divided into four parts. Part I consists of 8 questions regarding supply and demand for various early childhood education programs. Part II consists of 6 questions regarding kindergarten programming. Part III consists of 8 opinion questions relating to early childhood education issues, and two items concerning experience and education of principals in early childhood education for use in classifying and analyzing the survey results. All respondents, both public and nonpublic, are requested to complete all items in Parts I, II, and III. The pilot test results indicate that completion of Parts I, II, and III should take only about 15 to 20 minutes.

Part IV of the survey consists of a program questionnaire designed in a matrix form. This part should be completed by all public and nonpublic school principals who have one or more early childhood education programs other than regular half-day every-day kindergartens or special education programs operating in their school.

Each part is preceded by a brief statement of the purpose and instructions.

When completed, the instrument should be returned no later than **October 1, 1984** to the following address:

Illinois State Board of Education
Research and Statistics Section
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Research and Statistics Section
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

(1-15)

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM
Survey of Illinois Schools

DEFINITIONS:

Early childhood education means programs and services directed toward the care, development, and education of non-handicapped children between the ages of birth and eight years.

Childcare services are services that provide primarily supervision and custodial care for children. Childcare services may have an educational component.

Preschool services are services which emphasize educational and developmental activities as the primary focus of an organized and planned program for children not yet enrolled in kindergarten.

Latch-key programs are programs designed to provide supervision of children before and/or after regular school hours.

Transitional grades are intermediate grades that overlap two or more of the traditional grades kindergarten, 1, 2, or 3, and are designed for students who need additional educational services before transferring into the regular traditional grade. Children enrolled in these transitional grades may or may not be eligible for special education services.

Academically oriented programs refers to programs where the primary emphasis is on direct, formal instruction to develop reading and math skills.

Experiential/social/play oriented programs refers to programs where the primary emphasis is on child selected activities with concrete materials and experiences based on individual children's readiness for such experiences.

Parent education programs are programs designed to teach parents of young children methods and techniques of effective child development.

PART I Instructions:

Items 1 through 7 are for the purpose of assessing the need, supply, and demand for various types of early childhood education programs as perceived by principals in Illinois elementary schools (and other schools with ECE programs).

1. Which of the following best describes your perception of the current demand by parents for childcare/preschool services in the area served by your school?

(16) ☐ 1. Very High ☐ 2. High ☐ 3. Low ☐ 4. Very Low

2. Which of the following best describes the current supply of childcare/preschool services within the area served by your school relative to the demand by parents for such services?

(17) ☐ 1. Supply exceeds demand ☐ 2. Supply approximately equals demand ☐ 3. Supply is less than demand ☐ 4. Supply is much less than demand

3. What number of your currently enrolled students do you estimate need before or after school (latch-key) childcare?

(18-21) _____ Number (22) ☐ Don't know

4. What number of your entering Kindergarten population do you estimate have attended a preschool or childcare center?

(23-26) _____ Number (27) ☐ Don't know

5. Is there a regular system of communication and coordination between and among officials in your school, public school district officials and officials from local childcare centers and preschools?

(28) ☐ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No

If yes, which of the following kinds of officials are included in the communications network?

(29) ☐ Local public school officials
(30) ☐ Local private school officials
(31) ☐ Local daycare providers
(32) ☐ Local homecare providers
(33) ☐ Other (please specify) _____

6. Are any childcare or preschool programs operated in your school building by some other public or nonpublic agency or parent volunteers?

(34) ☐ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No

7. If yes, check the appropriate descriptor in each column below:

Type of Program	Operated By	School Space Is
(35) ☐ Childcare	(37) ☐ Private agency	(40) ☐ Rented/Leased
(36) ☐ Preschool	(38) ☐ Parent group	(41) ☐ Donated
	(39) ☐ Other Public Agency (specify) _____	

(79-80) Record 01

ISBE 86-32 (8/84)

PART II Instructions:

Items 8 through 13 are for the purpose of obtaining information about the types of Kindergarten programs currently in operation and screening instruments used at the Kindergarten level for various purposes. Please check the appropriate response or responses to each item as indicated.

8. Record the number of Kindergarten programs of each type listed below which are operating in your school.

(16-17)____ a. Regular half-day everyday Kindergarten with academic orientation
(18-19)____ b. Regular half-day everyday Kindergarten with experiential/social/play orientation
(20-21)____ c. All day alternate day Kindergarten with academic orientation
(22-23)____ d. All day alternate day Kindergarten with experiential/social/play orientation
(24-25)____ e. All day everyday Kindergarten with academic orientation
(26-27)____ f. All day everyday Kindergarten with experiential/social/play orientation
(28-29)____ g. Transitional Kindergarten
(30-31)____ h. Other(s), describe: _____

9. Have you modified your Kindergarten curriculum or added additional curricular options within the past 5 years to deal with differences in the readiness between children with preschool/childcare experience and children without such experience? Why?

(32) ☐ 1. YES Curriculum was modified for this reason.
☐ 2. YES Additional curricular options were added for this reason.
☐ 3. YES But, not because of differences in readiness of children with or without preschool experience.
Specify reason: _____
☐ 4. NO No differences in readiness have been observed.
☐ 5. NO No curricular changes have been needed or made for this reason.
☐ 6. NO But, curricular changes for this reason are anticipated in the near future.

10. Will your school offer a regular Kindergarten program for children to begin their schooling January or February, rather than this Fall?

(33) ☐ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No

11. Does your school or district routinely conduct developmental screening (other than Health, Vision, Hearing and Special Education Screening) for all children upon entrance to Kindergarten?

(34) ☐ 1. Yes (Please answer questions 12 and 13)
☐ 2. No (Skip to question 14)

12. When was developmental screening or testing conducted for children who will enroll in Kindergarten in the Fall term of the 1984-85 school year?

(35) ☐ March 84 (37) ☐ May 84 (39) ☐ July 84 (41) ☐ September 84
(36) ☐ April 84 (38) ☐ June 84 (40) ☐ August 84 (42) ☐ Other (specify)

13. PURPOSES

Development of a Kindergarten instructional plan for each child (Other than the IEP for Special Education)	Identification of children with potential special needs	Placement in alternative Kindergarten program	Recommendations for delay into Kindergarten	Other (please specify)	SCREENING INSTRUMENTS/TESTS
(16)____	(17)____	(18)____	(19)____	(20)____	ABC Inventory to Determine Kindergarten Readiness
(21)____	(22)____	(23)____	(24)____	(25)____	Boehm Test of Basic Concepts
(26)____	(27)____	(28)____	(29)____	(30)____	Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Basic Skills
(31)____	(32)____	(33)____	(34)____	(35)____	Denver Developmental Screening Test
(36)____	(37)____	(38)____	(39)____	(40)____	DIAL (Developmental Indicator for Assessment of Learning)
(41)____	(42)____	(43)____	(44)____	(45)____	Gesell Kindergarten Readiness Screening Test
(46)____	(47)____	(48)____	(49)____	(50)____	Metropolitan Readiness Tests
(51)____	(52)____	(53)____	(54)____	(55)____	Peabody Picture Vocabulary
(56)____	(57)____	(58)____	(59)____	(60)____	Peotone Early Prevention of School Failure
(61)____	(62)____	(63)____	(64)____	(65)____	Portage Checklist
(66)____	(67)____	(68)____	(69)____	(70)____	Screening Test of Academic Readiness
(16)____	(17)____	(18)____	(19)____	(20)____	Other(s), specify: _____
(21)____	(22)____	(23)____	(24)____	(25)____	Locally developed test(s)

(79-80) Record 03

(79-80) Record 02

INSTRUCTIONS: Which screening tests were used and for what purposes? Please place a check mark for each purpose which applies to each of the thirteen tests or instruments separately.

(79-80) Record 04

PART III Instructions:

Items 14 through 21 are designed to solicit the opinions of principals statewide regarding their view of the appropriate role of public schools in various aspects of early childhood education. Item 22 asks information concerning direct teaching experience at various levels for use in analyzing the results of this survey, and Item 23 asks for information concerning coursework or workshops in the area of child development. Please check the response to Items 15 through 21 that most accurately reflects your opinion on the issue addressed by each item. For Item 22 record the number of years of teaching experience you have had at each of the levels indicated. For Item 23 check the appropriate response.

NOTE: For Items 14 through 21 which follow, respond in accordance with your opinion AS IF COSTS WERE NOT A FACTOR. Nonpublic school officials are asked to respond to these items as well even though the questions deal with public school issues.

Do you agree or disagree that:

14. Chronological age should be the main criterion used to determine placement of children in kindergarten and first grade.

(16) ____ 1. Strongly Agree ____ 2. Agree ____ 3. Disagree ____ 4. Strongly Disagree

15. Each public school should offer before and after school childcare services (latch key services) for all school age children who need it.

(17) ____ 1. Strongly Agree ____ 2. Agree ____ 3. Disagree ____ 4. Strongly Disagree

16. Public schools should operate the Kindergarten program all-day everyday rather than half-day everyday or all-day on alternate days.

(18) ____ 1. Strongly Agree ____ 2. Agree ____ 3. Disagree ____ 4. Strongly Disagree

17. Public schools should offer a pre-kindergarten program to children between 3 and 5 years of age.

(19) ____ 1. Strongly Agree ____ 2. Agree ____ 3. Disagree ____ 4. Strongly Disagree

18. Public schools should offer childcare and educational experiences to infants and children below 3 years of age.

(20) ____ 1. Strongly Agree ____ 2. Agree ____ 3. Disagree ____ 4. Strongly Disagree

19. Public schools should offer parent education programs for teenage and adult parents.

(21) ____ 1. Strongly Agree ____ 2. Agree ____ 3. Disagree ____ 4. Strongly Disagree

20. Public schools should be allowed to charge tuition for childcare and preschool programs based upon the parents' (or guardians') ability to pay.

(22) ____ 1. Strongly Agree ____ 2. Agree ____ 3. Disagree ____ 4. Strongly Disagree

21. Any childcare or preschool services provided to parents by public schools should be provided at no cost to parents.

(23) ____ 1. Strongly Agree ____ 2. Agree ____ 3. Disagree ____ 4. Strongly Disagree

22. At which of the following levels or grades have you, the principal, had previous classroom teaching experience? (Record the approximate numbers of years taught at each level in the spaces provided.)

(24-25) ____ Pre-kindergarten *(28-29)* ____ Grade 1 *(32-33)* ____ Grade 3 *(36-37)* ____ Grades 9 to 12

(26-27) ____ Kindergarten *(30-31)* ____ Grade 2 *(34-35)* ____ Grade 4 to 8 *(38)* ____ None (check if none)

23. Within the last 10 years, have you, the principal, had any formal coursework or attended workshops that focused primarily on the development of young children (i.e. children below age 8)?

(check one)

(39) ____ 1. Yes, formal courses ____ 2. No formal courses ____ 3. No, but interested in formal courses

(check one)

(40) ____ 1. Yes, workshops ____ 2. No workshops ____ 3. No, but interested in workshops

PART IV Instructions: *This part is to be completed only if an early childhood education program other than a regular half-day everyday kindergarten program or special education program is operated in your school under your jurisdiction. Use one column for each program. Record the information requested regarding each program in the space provided according to the instructions along side each item 1 through 13.*

PRINCIPAL'S NAME	TELEPHONE NUMBER	PROGRAM 1	PROGRAM 2	PROGRAM 3	PROGRAM 4	PROGRAM 5	PROGRAM 6
1. Record the name of this program as used in the district to describe the program.							
2. Check the number which best describes the type of program. (Check 1 number for each program) See definitions on page 1.		*(16)*	*(16)*	*(16)*	*(16)*	*(16)*	*(16)*
1. Transitional	5. Kindergarten--all-day everyday	___ 1. ___ 5.	___ 1. ___ 5.	___ 1. ___ 5.	___ 1. ___ 5.	___ 1. ___ 5.	___ 1. ___ 5.
2. Childcare	6. Kindergarten--all-day alternate day	___ 2. ___ 6.	___ 2. ___ 6.	___ 2. ___ 6.	___ 2. ___ 6.	___ 2. ___ 6.	___ 2. ___ 6.
3. Latch Key (5 yrs. & up)	7. Head Start Program	___ 3. ___ 7.	___ 3. ___ 7.	___ 3. ___ 7.	___ 3. ___ 7.	___ 3. ___ 7.	___ 3. ___ 7.
4. Preschool	8. Other--specify	___ 4. ___ 8.	___ 4. ___ 8.	___ 4. ___ 8.	___ 4. ___ 8.	___ 4. ___ 8.	___ 4. ___ 8.
		Specify	Specify	Specify	Specify	Specify	Specify
3. Is this program primarily: (Check 1 number for each program)		*(17)*	*(17)*	*(17)*	*(17)*	*(17)*	*(17)*
1. Academically oriented		___ 1.	___ 1.	___ 1.	___ 1.	___ 1.	___ 1.
2. Experiential/social/play oriented		___ 2.	___ 2.	___ 2.	___ 2.	___ 2.	___ 2.
3. Balance of both		___ 3.	___ 3.	___ 3.	___ 3.	___ 3.	___ 3.
4. How many children are served in this program?		*(18-21)* _____	*(18-21)* _____	*(18-21)* _____	*(18-21)* _____	*(18-21)* _____	*(18-21)* _____
5a. Is there a waiting list for this program?		*(22)* ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No	*(22)* ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No	*(22)* ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No	*(22)* ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No	*(22)* ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No	*(22)* ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No
5b. If 5a. is "Yes," how many children are on the waiting list?		*(23-26)* _____	*(23-26)* _____	*(23-26)* _____	*(23-26)* _____	*(23-26)* _____	*(23-26)* _____
6. What is the age range of children served in this program?		**Youngest** *(27-28)* ___ Yrs. *(29-30)* ___ Mos. **Oldest:** *(31-32)* ___ Yrs. *(33-34)* ___ Mos.	**Youngest** *(27-28)* ___ Yrs. *(29-30)* ___ Mos. **Oldest:** *(31-32)* ___ Yrs. *(33-34)* ___ Mos.	**Youngest** *(27-28)* ___ Yrs. *(29-30)* ___ Mos. **Oldest:** *(31-32)* ___ Yrs. *(33-34)* ___ Mos.	**Youngest** *(27-28)* ___ Yrs. *(29-30)* ___ Mos. **Oldest:** *(31-32)* ___ Yrs. *(33-34)* ___ Mos.	**Youngest** *(27-28)* ___ Yrs. *(29-30)* ___ Mos. **Oldest:** *(31-32)* ___ Yrs. *(33-34)* ___ Mos.	**Youngest** *(27-28)* ___ Yrs. *(29-30)* ___ Mos. **Oldest:** *(31-32)* ___ Yrs. *(33-34)* ___ Mos.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART IV - Continued	PROGRAM 1	PROGRAM 2	PROGRAM 3	PROGRAM 4	PROGRAM 5	PROGRAM 6
7. How many paid and volunteer staff are used for the program?						
Full-Time Paid	(35-36) ____	(35-36) ____	(35-36) ____	(35-36) ____	(35-36) ____	(35-36) ____
Part-Time Paid	(37-38) ____	(37-38) ____	(37-38) ____	(37-38) ____	(37-38) ____	(37-38) ____
Full-Time Volunteer	(39-40) ____	(39-40) ____	(39-40) ____	(39-40) ____	(39-40) ____	(39-40) ____
Part-Time Volunteer	(41-42) ____	(41-42) ____	(41-42) ____	(41-42) ____	(41-42) ____	(41-42) ____
8. How many of the staff in # 7 above are:						
Certificated teachers	(43-44) ____	(43-44) ____	(43-44) ____	(43-44) ____	(43-44) ____	(43-44) ____
4 year college graduates other than certificated teachers	(45-46) ____	(45-46) ____	(45-46) ____	(45-46) ____	(45-46) ____	(45-46) ____
2 year college graduates	(47-48) ____	(47-48) ____	(47-48) ____	(47-48) ____	(47-48) ____	(47-48) ____
CDA (Child Development Associate) credentialed	(49-50) ____	(49-50) ____	(49-50) ____	(49-50) ____	(49-50) ____	(49-50) ____
9. Check all letters indicating which of the following admission criteria are applicable to this program.						
a. Age	(51) ____ a.	(51) ____ a.	(51) ____ a.	(51) ____ a.	(51) ____ a.	(51) ____ a.
b. Child must be toilet trained	(52) ____ b.	(52) ____ b.	(52) ____ b.	(52) ____ b.	(52) ____ b.	(52) ____ b.
c. Family income below a certain level	(53) ____ c.	(53) ____ c.	(53) ____ c.	(53) ____ c.	(53) ____ c.	(53) ____ c.
d. Limited to children of school-age parents	(54) ____ d.	(54) ____ d.	(54) ____ d.	(54) ____ d.	(54) ____ d.	(54) ____ d.
e. Limited to children of employed parents	(55) ____ e.	(55) ____ e.	(55) ____ e.	(55) ____ e.	(55) ____ e.	(55) ____ e.
f. Limited to children of single parents	(56) ____ f.	(56) ____ f.	(56) ____ f.	(56) ____ f.	(56) ____ f.	(56) ____ f.
g. Limited to children of school staff	(57) ____ g.	(57) ____ g.	(57) ____ g.	(57) ____ g.	(57) ____ g.	(57) ____ g.
h. Results of screening/readiness tests--specify	(58) ____ h.	(58) ____ h.	(58) ____ h.	(58) ____ h.	(58) ____ h.	(58) ____ h.
i. Other--specify	Specify ____	Specify ____	Specify ____	Specify ____	Specify ____	Specify ____
	(59) ____ i. Specify ____	(59) ____ i. Specify ____	(59) ____ i. Specify ____	(59) ____ i. Specify ____	(59) ____ i. Specify ____	(59) ____ i. Specify ____
10. Check the letters of the following exit criteria which are applicable to the program.						
a. Teacher evaluation	(60) ____ a.	(60) ____ a.	(60) ____ a.	(60) ____ a.	(60) ____ a.	(60) ____ a.
b. Age	(61) ____ b.	(61) ____ b.	(61) ____ b.	(61) ____ b.	(61) ____ b.	(61) ____ b.
c. Locally developed test	(62) ____ c.	(62) ____ c.	(62) ____ c.	(62) ____ c.	(62) ____ c.	(62) ____ c.
d. Standardized test/scale--specify	(63) ____ d.	(63) ____ d.	(63) ____ d.	(63) ____ d.	(63) ____ d.	(63) ____ d.
e. Other--specify	Specify ____	Specify ____	Specify ____	Specify ____	Specify ____	Specify ____
	(64) ____ e. Specify ____	(64) ____ e. Specify ____	(64) ____ e. Specify ____	(64) ____ e. Specify ____	(64) ____ e. Specify ____	(64) ____ e. Specify ____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART IV - Continued	PROGRAM 1	PROGRAM 2	PROGRAM 3	PROGRAM 4	PROGRAM 5	PROGRAM 6
11. Check the appropriate letters if this program includes:						
a. A parent education component	(65) ____ a.	(65) ____ a.	(65) ____ a.	(65) ____ a.	(65) ____ a.	(65) ____ a.
b. A latch key component	(66) ____ b.	(66) ____ b.	(66) ____ b.	(66) ____ b.	(66) ____ b.	(66) ____ b.
c. Frequent child evaluation/screenings during the course of the program	(67) ____ c.	(67) ____ c.	(67) ____ c.	(67) ____ c.	(67) ____ c.	(67) ____ c.
12. Check the appropriate letters if this program is operated:						
a. All day	(68) ____ a.	(68) ____ a.	(68) ____ a.	(68) ____ a.	(68) ____ a.	(68) ____ a.
b. Half day	(69) ____ b.	(69) ____ b.	(69) ____ b.	(69) ____ b.	(69) ____ b.	(69) ____ b.
c. Only on school days	(70) ____ c.	(70) ____ c.	(70) ____ c.	(70) ____ c.	(70) ____ c.	(70) ____ c.
d. On school days and school holidays	(71) ____ d.	(71) ____ d.	(71) ____ d.	(71) ____ d.	(71) ____ d.	(71) ____ d.
e. Before and after regular school hours	(72) ____ e.	(72) ____ e.	(72) ____ e.	(72) ____ e.	(72) ____ e.	(72) ____ e.
f. During the summer	(73) ____ f.	(73) ____ f.	(73) ____ f.	(73) ____ f.	(73) ____ f.	(73) ____ f.
g. Less than 5 days per week-- specify	(74) ____ g. Specify _____	(74) ____ g. Specify _____	(74) ____ g. Specify _____	(74) ____ g. Specify _____	(74) ____ g. Specify _____	(74) ____ g. Specify _____
h. Other, specify	(75) ____ h. Specify _____	(75) ____ h. Specify _____	(75) ____ h. Specify _____	(75) ____ h. Specify _____	(75) ____ h. Specify _____	(75) ____ h Specify _____
	(79-80) Record 06	(79-80) Record 08	(79-80) Record 10	(79-80) Record 12	(79-80) Record 14	(79-80) Record 16
13. What is the approximate percent of the cost financed from: (These must total to 100%)	%	%	%	%	%	%
a. General school funds	(16-18) ____ a.	(16-18) ____ a.	(16-18) ____ a.	(16-18) ____ a.	(16-18) ____ a.	(16-18) ____ a
b. Tuition	(19-21) ____ b.	(19-21) ____ b.	(19-21) ____ b.	(19-21) ____ b.	(19-21) ____ b.	(19-21) ____ b.
c. Federal grants	(22-24) ____ c.	(22-24) ____ c.	(22-24) ____ c.	(22-24) ____ c.	(22-24) ____ c.	(22-24) ____ c
d. Donations	(25-27) ____ d.	(25-27) ____ d.	(25-27) ____ d.	(25-27) ____ d.	(25-27) ____ d.	(25-27) ____ d.
e. Other sources	(28-30) ____ e.	(28-30) ____ e.	(28-30) ____ e.	(28-30) ____ e.	(28-30) ____ e.	(28-30) ____ e.
	(79-80) Record 07	(79-80) Record 09	(79-80) Record 11	(79-80) Record 13	(79-80) Record 15	(79-80) Record 17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Carefully fill out forms. Then fold as shown on inside back cover.

PLEASE FOLD ALONG DOTTED LINE FOR MAILING
WITH BUSINESS REPLY MAIL OUTSIDE

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF
MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST CLASS PERMIT 1499 SPRINGFIELD, IL

Illinois State Board of Education
Research and Statistics Section
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

W-279

Tape
Here

Illinois
State Board of
Education

100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Walter W. Naumer, Jr., Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

Important Message

from your Illinois State Board of Education

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
PROGRAM SURVEY
OF ILLINOIS SCHOOLS

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois
September 1984 7.5M 5-173F-86 No. 309

Policy Statement on Early Childhood Education

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois
July 1985 9000 5- 1134Br. 86 No. 309

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State Board of Education Policy Statement on Early Childhood Education Adopted May 9, 1985 Springfield, Illinois

Early childhood education, for the purposes of this policy, constitutes those educational programs, practices, and services which have as a primary focus the developmental needs of children prior to the time they enter first grade. It will be the policy of the Illinois State Board of Education to seek such support as is necessary to encourage the development of early childhood education programs based on the following considerations.

A) Positive, nurturing experiences in the early years of life are essential in helping children develop intellectually, socially, and emotionally, and future academic success in school is strongly influenced by the character of early experiences.

B) Children identified as being at risk of academic failure can dramatically improve their chances for success through participation in early childhood education programs.

C) Significant developmental differences exist among children, and particular attention should be given to such individual differences in the development of early education programs and services.

D) Meeting the education, health, welfare, and safety needs of young children requires collaboration among various childcare providers.

E) The quality of instructional staff and leadership are especially critical elements in effective early childhood education programs.

The Board adopted the following recommendations.

The Board should seek legislation to:

PREKINDERGARTEN

A) Require that school districts develop screening procedures, by January 1986, for the purpose of identifying children at risk of academic failure, such screening procedures to be based on criteria promulgated by the State Board of Education;

B) Require school districts to identify all resident children who are to reach their fourth birthday by December 1, 1986; educationally screen such children; and through doing so, identify those among them who are judged to be at risk of academic failure;

C) Require school districts to provide beginning in fall, 1986, full-day prekindergarten programs for all resident children having been identified through the district screening procedures as being at risk of academic failure.

Further, the State Board of Education should:

D) Assume a leadership role in cooperation with other State agencies having a shared interest in the welfare of young children, particularly the Departments of Children and Family Services, Public Health, and Public Aid, in developing an intra-state data bank of registered, licensed, or approved childcare, daycare, or preschool providers by school district and making such information available to the public. Such cooperation should also be directed at assuring consistency of policies and regulations regarding the educational component of programs for young children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN

A) Encourage local school districts, by the opening of school, fall 1985, to provide full-day kindergarten for all children;

B) Require local school districts, by the opening of school, fall, 1986, to provide full-day kindergarten for all children; and

C) Stipulate that while children whose fifth birthdays occur by December 1 of a given year are eligible to attend kindergarten, children under this age may enroll in kindergarten if they are deemed ready to attend school and that no child eligible by age to attend school be denied entrance into school.

Concurrent with Board action, the agency will:

A) Design a comprehensive public awareness program to inform Illinois policymakers, citizens, parents, and educational personnel of the importance of early childhood education and of the importance of parental involvement in such programs;

B) Identify exemplary prekindergarten and kindergarten programs, widely disseminate findings and coordinate the training necessary to the wide adoption of such programs;

C) Initiate and support efforts to improve the preservice and inservice training of early childhood education teachers, elementary teachers, and principals; and

D) Engage in further study of the issue of parent education in Illinois schools, identify the range and character of needs, explore alternatives, and offer appropriate recommendations to the State Board of Education.